



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

Per. 971 e. $\frac{127}{23.24}$

THE
BRITISH CRITIC,
AND
QUARTERLY
THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

VOLUME XXIII.

LONDON:
PRINTED FOR J. G. & F. RIVINGTON,
ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD, AND WATERLOO-PLACE, PALL-MALL;
AND
SOLD BY BELL AND BRADFUTE, EDINBURGH; AND
MILLIKEN, DUBLIN.

1838.

Per. 971 e. $\frac{127}{23.24}$

THE
BRITISH CRITIC,
AND
QUARTERLY
THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

VOLUME XXIII.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR J. G. & F. RIVINGTON,
ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD, AND WATERLOO-PLACE, PALL-MALL;
AND
SOLD BY BELL AND BRADFUTE, EDINBURGH; AND
MILLIKEN, DUBLIN.

1838.



LONDON:
C. ROWORTH AND SONS, BELL YARD,
TEMPLE BAR.

CONTENTS

OF

Nº. XLVI.

	PAGE.
ART. I. The Life and Times of the Rev. George Whitefield, M.A. By Robert Philip	265
II. 1. The Primitive Doctrine of Election ; or an Historical Inquiry into the Ideality and Causation of Scriptural Election, as received and maintained in the Primitive Church of Christ. By G. S. Faber, B.D.	
2. The Doctrine of Election, and its Connection with the general Tenor of Christianity, illustrated from many parts of Scripture, and especially from the Epistle to the Romans. By Thomas Erskine, Esq.	299
III. 1. The 51st Report of the Society for the Support and Encouragement of Sunday Schools throughout the British Dominions.	
2. The 34th Annual Report of the Sunday School Union.	
3. The 32d Report of British and Foreign School Society.	
4. The 26th Report of the National Society for promoting the Education of the Poor.	
5. The 1st Annual Report of the Home and Colonial Infant School Society.	
6. The 1st Publication of the Central Society of Education, 1837 ; and Schools for the Industrious Classes, or the Present State of Education among the Working People of England	329
IV. 1. The Study of Morals vindicated and recommended, in a Sermon preached before the University of Oxford. By Henry Arthur Woodgate, B.D.	
2. The Law of the Mind and the Law of the Members, a Sermon preached before the University of Oxford, with Notes and an Appendix. By Charles Henry Craufurd, M.A.	
3. On the Foundations of Morals. Four Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge, November, 1837. By Rev. William Whewell.	
4. The Dangers and Safeguards of Ethical Science: the Inaugural Lecture of the Rev. W. Sewell, M.A.	
5. Remarks upon the Aristotelian and Platonic Ethics, as a branch of the Studies pursued in the University of Oxford. By Rev. Frederick Oakeley, M.A.....	376

	PAGE.
ART. V. 1. Connection of Sacred and Profane History, from the Death of Joshua to the Decline of the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah. (Intended to complete the Works of Shuckford and Prideaux.) By Rev. Michael Russell, D.D.	
2. Histoire des Juifs dans le Moyen Age.....	396
VI. M. Cousin's Report on the State of Education in Holland. Translated by Mr. Horner	439
VII. 1. Draft of a Fifth Report of the Commissioners appointed to consider the State of the Established Church in England and Wales, with reference to Ecclesiastical Revenues; also the Correspondence thereon. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 22d December, 1837.	
2. Chapter and Collegiate Memorials, addressed to the Church Commissioners in 1836 and 1837.	
3. A Letter on the Augmentation of a particular Class of Poor Livings, &c. By the Earl of Harrowby.	
4. A Bill to abridge the holding of Benefices in Plurality, &c. Printed 23d December, 1837.	
5. The Ecclesiastical Commission and the Universities. By Christopher Wordsworth, D.D.	
6. Some Observations on the tendency of a Measure for the future Regulation of Cathedral and Collegiate Bodies, &c. By J. H. Spry, D.D.	
7. The Principle of the Ecclesiastical Commission examined, &c. By H. E. Manniug, M.A.	
8. The Correspondence between the Ecclesiastical Commission and the Bishop of Ely.	
9. A Charge to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Durham. By C. Thorp, D.D.	
10. The Prebendary, or Cathedral Establishment; being the Substance of Letters in the Morning Herald. Part I.	
11. Are Cathedral Institutions useless? a Practical Answer to this Question.	
12. On the Proceedings of the Ecclesiastical Commission, &c. By C. Benson, M.A.	
13. Reduction of Prebendaries. By F. A. Glover, M.A.	
14. Observations on the Illegal and Unconstitutional Character of the Ecclesiastical Commission. By a Layman.	
15. "Continuing daily with one accord in the Temple." A Sermon on the Daily Service of the Church, &c. By the Very Rev. George Chandler, D.C.L.	455
NOTICES OF BOOKS	569

INDEX OF BOOKS REVIEWED,

OR

NOTICED IN THE ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

•• For Remarkable Passages in the Criticisms, Extracts, and Ecclesiastical Record, see the Index at the end of the Volume.

A.

A Bill to abridge the holding of Benefices in Plurality, 455.

A Letter on the Augmentation of a particular Class of Poor Livings. By the Earl of Harrowby, 455.

Anderam (Rev. James S. M.), *Sermons on Various Subjects*, 103.

Are Cathedral Institutions useless? A practical Answer to this Question, 455.

A Sketch of the History of the Church of England to the Revolution, 1688. By Thomas Vowler Short, B.D., 48.

B.

Baxter (Richard), *Life and Times of.* By the Rev. William Orme, 48.

Benson (Rev. C.), *On the Proceedings of the Ecclesiastical Commission*, 455.

Book of the Fathers, containing Lives of celebrated Fathers of the Christian Church, and the Spirit of their Writings, 24.

C.

Chapter and Collegiate Memorials, 455.

Chandler (Rev. George), D.C.L., *Sermon on the Daily Service of the Church*, 455.

Charges of the Right Rev. the Bishops of Durham, Winchester, and Lincoln, in the year 1837..174.

Charge to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Durham, 455.

Colquhoun (J. C.), *The System of National Education in Ireland*, 566.

Commissioners appointed to consider the State of the Established Church in England and Wales. Their Fifth Report, 455.

Connection of Sacred and Profane History, VOL. XXIII.

from the death of Joshua to the Decline of the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah. By the Rev. Michael Russell, D.D., 396.

"Continuing daily with one accord in the Temple." A Sermon, 455.

Cousin (M.), *Report on the State of Education in Holland.* Translated by Mr. Horner, 439.

Craufurd (Rev. C. H.), *The Law of the Mind and the Law of the Members.* A Sermon, 376.

D.

Durham (The Right Rev. the Bishop of), *Charge to his Clergy in 1837..174.*

E.

Ecclesiastical Commission, and the Universities, 455.

_____ correspondence between, and the Bishop of Ely, 455.
_____ on the proceedings of, *ib.*

_____ on the illegal character of, *ib.*

Erskine (Thomas), Esq., *The Doctrine of Election, illustrated from the Epistle to the Romans*, 299.

F.

Faber (Rev. G. S.), *The Primitive Doctrine of Election*, 299.

Froude (Rev. Richard Hurrell), *Remains*, 200.

Fysh (Frederic), "The Beast and his Image," 563.

G.

Glover (Rev. F. A.), *Reduction of Prebendaries*, 455.

H.

- Harrowby* (Earl of), Letter on the Augmentation of a particular Class of Poor Livings, &c., 455.
Histoire des Juifs dans le Moyen Age, 396.

K.

- Knox* (Alexander, Esq.), Remains, 1.

L.

- Lincoln* (The Right Rev. the Bishop of), Charge to his Clergy in 1837..174.

M.

- Manning* (H. E.), The Principle of the Ecclesiastical Commission examined, 455.
Metropolis Churches Fund, First Report of, up to June 23, 1837..179.

O.

- Oaksley* (Rev. F.), Remarks upon the Aristotelian and Platonic Ethics, as a branch of the Studies pursued in the University of Oxford, 376.
Observations on the Illegal and Unconstitutional Character of the Ecclesiastical Commission, 455.
O'Connor (Henry), Connected Essays and Tracts, 567.
Orme (Rev. William), The Life and Times of Richard Baxter, 48.

P.

- Palin* (Rev. William), Village Lectures on the Litany, 567.
Pashley's Travels in Crete, 225.
Pusey (Rev. Dr.), Patience and Confidence the Strength of the Church. A Sermon preached on the Fifth of November, before the University of Oxford, 140.

Q.

- Quin* (Edward), An Universal History, 565.

R.

- Reid* (Rev. James Seaton), D.D., The History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, 149.
Report of the Society for the Support and Encouragement of Sunday Schools, 329.
 — of the British and Foreign School Society, *ib.*

S.

- Sewell* (Rev. W.), the Dangers and Safeguards of Ethical Science. (Inaugural Lecture), 376.
Short (Rev. T. V.), A Sketch of the History of the Church of England to the Revolution, 1688..48.
Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. Two Memorials addressed to the General Meeting of, 113.
Society for Promoting the Employment of additional Curates in Populous Places. Preliminary Paper, 179.
Spry (Rev. J. H.), D.D., Some Observations on the tendency of a Measure for the future Regulation of Cathedral and Collegiate Bodies, 455.
Stuart (Moses), A Grammar of the New Testament Dialect, 565.

T.

- The Ecclesiastical Commission and the Universities*, 455.
The Prebendary, or Cathedral Establishment, 455.
The Primitive Doctrine of Election. By G. S. Faber, B.D., 299.
The Vicar of Wrexhill. By Mrs. Trollope, 85.
Thorp (Rev. C.), D.D., Charge to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Durham, 455.
Travels in Crete. By R. Pashley, Esq., 225.
Treffry (Richard), An Inquiry into the Doctrine of the Eternal Sonship of our Lord Jesus Christ, 566.
Two Memorials, addressed to the General Meeting of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, on the alleged corrupt character of some of its Publications, 113.

W.

- Whewell* (Rev. William), On the Foundation of Morals. Four Sermons, 376.
Whitefield (Rev. George), Life and Times. By Robert Philip, 265.
Winchester (The Right Rev. the Bishop of), Charge to his Clergy in 1837..174.
Woodgate (Rev. H. A.), The Study of Morals vindicated and recommended. A Sermon, 376.
Wordsworth (Rev. Christopher), D.D., The Ecclesiastical Commission and the Universities, 455.

THE
BRITISH CRITIC,
AND
Quarterly Theological Review,

JANUARY, 1838.

ART. I.—*Remains of Alexander Knox, Esq.* London: Duncan.
1837. Vols. III. and IV.

THE writings of Alexander Knox have already occupied a goodly amount of our pages. Two of our articles have already been devoted to an examination of the character of his mind, and the somewhat eccentric trajectory of his thoughts; and we are now invited to further excursions with him into the loftier regions of theological speculation. The materials of the work now before us were found by the editor among Mr. Knox's papers, not indeed definitively arranged, or wrought up, for publication; but, nevertheless, in a condition which may help to complete the portraiture of his intellect, already before the public in the former volumes of his *Remains*.

It will, doubtless, be remembered by our readers that the prominent peculiarities of Mr. Knox, as a theologian, are to be found, first, in his meditations on the ways of Divine Providence; and secondly, in his somewhat startling expositions of what we are accustomed to hear spoken of as the test of a church's stability or decline,—the great doctrine of Justification. The notions put forth by him on the latter subject, more especially, would appear to have come across the path of our Protestant Divinity with a disturbing influence similar to that of a comet upon the orbit of our globe. They perplexed the hearts of many with "fear of change," and convulsion. It was even doubted whether they might not exert a fearful tendency to hurry us back into the darkest realms of popery and superstition. By some, it is true, the *nucleus* of this strange luminary was supposed to be quite as unsubstantial, as its path was devious. But the more general impression was, that the "extravagant and erring" light boded

little but disaster to Christendom, and threatened a fearful dislocation to all the grander symmetries of the Reformed Faith. And the consequence was, not only deep "searchings of heart" among thoughtful and sober-minded men, but, also,—we are grieved to add,—occasionally, certain abusive and virulent adjurations against the wild and dangerous intruder. In the midst of all this commotion, we have contrived to possess our souls in peace. The public are aware that we have, by no means, been disposed to accompany the wanderer, with much complacency, throughout all the irregularities of his course. In plain terms, we have gently, but distinctly, protested against his favourite views on the subject of justification; and we have, further, declared our inaptitude for comprehending, in the whole of its transcendental compass, his theory of God's providential administration. But still, we have always been very much at ease respecting the issue of the debate. We can scarcely muster an apprehension of portentous danger from the meditations of a recluse and solitary thinker, whose life exhibited the pattern of every Christian grace. Such a man, even in his wildest aberrations, may chance to recall the public attention to certain portions of obsolete and long-forgotten truth. And, wherever the truth may have been forgotten, or misapprehended, by himself, the error is sure to encounter, on the instant, a powerfully neutralizing process, in the vigilant and conscientious hostility of those, who are very jealous for the received verity.

But further,—closely connected with Mr. Knox's speculations on the ways of God in justifying the believer, was his mode of contemplating the one great Sacrifice once offered, for the redemption of the human race. According to the notions usually entertained by the Protestant Churches, the cross of Christ is the grand and central object in their system of theology. To the eye of faith, as purged and purified by the Reformation, the cross is like the brazen serpent in the Wilderness, the perpetual sight of which can alone disarm, of their fiery and destructive venom, the secret enemies who lie in wait to "assault and hurt the soul." In tribulation or in wealth, in health or sickness, in life or death,—the cross is the sign on which the gaze of the believer is fixed, as affording the only certain presage of victory to the faithful soldier and servant of the Captain of our salvation. When the heart is oppressed by manifold temptations, this is the *heavenly vision*, which brings back thoughts of fortitude and comfort, and hopes *full of immortality*. In the season of complacency and peace, this is the spectacle which reminds the slumberer of the perils of security. Thus it is, we believe, for the most part, with those who profess the truth for which our martyr bishops poured

out their souls unto death. But this, it must be acknowledged, was not precisely the view of redemption which presented itself to the meditations of Alexander Knox. The cross was *not* the central object of his divinity. In his theological *panorama*, if we may so express it, the cross seems to have held a somewhat remote and subordinate position. It appears, there, fast by the entrance into the kingdom of God, instead of being lifted up, on the heights of the *acropolis*. In other words, his chief reliance was, not so much on what Christ had, once for all, effected for the whole human race, as upon that which Christ stands pledged to accomplish within the heart of every true believer. By the grand propitiation—he conceived—the whole world was placed within the possibility of salvation. To him, therefore, the blood of the covenant, although it spoke of far better things than were ever uttered by the tongue of man, yet spoke only of redemption *offered*; while the work of the Spirit in the human soul, spoke not only of redemption *offered*, but of redemption *realized*. To express his sentiments, in the words of his editor,—“for the in-
 “estimable benefit of *salvability*, he was deeply thankful. For
 “the *far mightier* work by which he was personally transferred
 “into a state of salvation, he was impressed with still deeper
 “emotions of gratitude. But, believing that an uncorrupt life
 “was the preliminary, or concomitant, to the blessedness of *dwell-*
 “*ling in God’s tabernacle*, and, still more, of *resting on his holy*
 “*hill*,—and that *every man who hath this hope in him, purifieth*
 “*himself, even as he is pure*,—believing this, he watched, with
 “eager solicitude, the variations of his inward life, and trem-
 “bled, not without some portion of a faithlessness, which he
 “condemned, so often as he felt any passing cloud interpose be-
 “tween the fruit of his maturing grace, and that fuller lustre
 “which, at other times, beamed on him from the Sun of Righte-
 “ousness.”

Now, in the estimate of any one who might intimately know the sensitive integrity and shrinking purity of the man, all this would amount to little more than the expression of an intense and sleepless anxiety to *make his calling and election sure*. In the judgment of others, it might be thought to imply a want of that keen and clear-sighted faith which can look, through the darkest shadows of temptation, towards the countenance of Him who is invisible. By persons of this stamp, the self-distrust of Knox might be thought to dishonour the faithfulness of God. According to their conceptions, the cross of Christ is the emblem and the pledge both of pardon and of peace. It not only ministers an *abundant entrance* into the kingdom of grace, but it is moreover the constant and unfailing refuge of all who have been

admitted within the precincts; and who, being there, retain a deep habitual sense of their manifold and sore necessities. For A. Knox, however, the *blood of sprinkling* is supposed to have done little more, than to satisfy him, that the destroyer had once been averted from his dwelling: and to have given him no distinct assurance that a preservative and healing power was constantly present with him. For the evidences; and the indications, of this blessed security, he was perpetually searching the depths of his own heart, and scrutinizing the tenor of his own life: and, hence it probably is, that he has been thought by some to have encouraged a relapse into the covenant of works,—and to have done all that man can do to rob the Christian of his most precious hope, and to spread the darkness of a disastrous eclipse between this fallen world and the brightness of the Sun of Righteousness.

We cannot confidently presume to specify how close an approximation there may have been between the views of Mr. Knox, and the formidable maxims which, of late, have been propounded, in some quarters, touching the doctrine of repentance. We presume, however, that he would have scarcely been prepared to affirm that repentance for sins committed subsequently to baptism, is insufficient to reinstate the offender on the firm ground of God's covenanted mercies. Neither can we venture, within the compass of these pages, to assume the awful task of arbitrating between the opinions which are now in conflict throughout *this* region of our theology. It is more to our present purpose to observe, that they who are most deeply affected with a distrust of Mr. Knox's divinity, have shown themselves disposed to bring the question to a practical issue. In the spirit of the *inductive* philosophy, of which we now hear so much, they have been for comparing the theory with the phenomena; and their report is, that the theory and the phenomena are at variance with each other. What the theory is, we have endeavoured to show. What the phenomena are, the adversaries have been at some pains to tell us. Their reasoning, if we rightly understand it, is this,—if the principles of Alexander Knox were in conformity with God's revealed truth, they *must* have yielded him the fruits of peace and comfort, in his life, and in his death. But, his principles yielded him neither consolation nor support. They were to him like the staff of a broken reed. The conclusion is obvious. His house must have been built upon the sand. He never can have touched the foundation of the everlasting Rock.

That Mr. Knox himself, towards the close of his life, was haunted by a painful consciousness of the imperfection of his own theory, has, of late, been currently, and very confidently, rumoured in what is called the religious world. The report appears to have gathered form and substance in the course of the

last year. In the month of August, 1836, (we borrow the statement of the editor of these volumes), an article appeared in the *Christian Observer*, the object of which was to inform the public, on the authority of one of Mr. Knox's friends, that, previously to his death, an important change had taken place in his "views;"—that he began to suspect that these "views" had not been "*sufficiently evangelical*;"—and that, to this cause, he was disposed to trace the then existing depression of his mind." The friend of Mr. Knox, on whose authority this statement got into circulation, was Mr. Kelly. And it further appears, that the surmises of Mr. Kelly had their basis, chiefly, on the following circumstances, which occurred a short time previously to the death of Mr. Knox. "Before you go"—said Mr. Knox to his friend, after an interesting conversation on spiritual matters—"before you go, you must offer up a prayer for me." The prayer was accordingly offered up; and it was conceived, as Mr. Kelly reports, in conformity with the principles—the *evangelical* principles—which sustained his (Mr. Kelly's) own mind. And, after the prayer was finished—we are told—Mr. Knox, once and again, cordially expressed his thanks. The inference is irresistible. The mind of Mr. Knox must evidently at that moment have been in perfect and entire harmony with what are called *evangelical* principles!

Now—without the slightest desire or intention to make this an opportunity of sitting in judgment on the controversy between *evangelical* principles, and any other principles—we must frankly confess that it has never been our chance to meet with a logical process much more unsatisfactory than the above! A Christian man, on the supposed approach of his last hour, requests a friend to pray for him, in his presence and hearing. The prayer, we are to presume, is conceived in a spirit of fervent piety; and uttered in a tone of profound sympathy with the necessities of the sufferer. It comprises many topics of comfort and edification, which are as the balm from Gilead to the soul of the dying man. And who would ever dream that the dying man could be, in the very crisis of his expected change, so possessed with the passion for theological analysis, as to exclaim,—“Your preparation, on the whole, is salutary and comfortable; but, still, I cannot but detect in it certain ingredients by which my palate is grievously offended. There is too much in it of a certain savour which may be agreeable to senses exercised in the discernment of good and evil by the discipline of a particular school. My religious tastes have been differently formed. And therefore, though your friendly and charitable intentions are entitled to my best acknowledgments, I must beg of you to dismiss all hope of success in the attempt to number me among your proselytes.” Oh! how little do they, who reason after

the fashion of Mr. Kelly,—how little do they know of the eagerness with which the fainting heart seizes on the grand and simple verities of the Christian faith, when the hour of death is at hand, and the day of judgment immediately in prospect! How little do they know of the distaste with which the spiritual palate then recoils from the acrid savours of dissension and debate! How little do they know of the predominance which the spirit of love begins to exercise over every faculty of the chastened soul, in that solemn season when flesh and heart are failing, and when Faith is about to be lost in sight, and Hope in fruition. The inference drawn by this worthy and exemplary man, from the cordial acknowledgments of his dying friend, is, that “he had found his theories, however ingenious, fail him in the hour of need.” Our inference, on the contrary, is, that the expiring Christian seized on every word from the lips of his brother in Christ, which might chance to be in harmony with his own views and feelings,—that he could not suffer his thoughts, or his emotions, or his failing strength, to run to waste in fruitless discussion on points of difference between them,—and that he poured out his heart in thankfulness for the kindly ministrations of a righteous and a faithful friend. Why,—we can even imagine that it would be no ordinary blessing to hear, by our dying bed, the orisons of a Pascal, or a Fenelon, or of any one resembling them,—albeit they might be tainted, more or less, by error or by superstition. The time would be much too short, and much too awful, for disputation. The error and the superstition, therefore, we should quietly and secretly reject. The fervent prayer of faith, and the blessed aspirations of love, we should receive into our hearts with comfort and with gratitude.

Let it be again remembered, the question at this moment before us, is *not* whether the opinions of Mr. Kelly or of Mr. Knox were sound or unsound. The sole question is, whether Mr. Knox was ever driven to a persuasion of the dangers and the treacheries of his own scheme of belief, and whether he was ever impelled to take refuge in the sanctuary of that system, which, nearly all his life long, he had been declaring to be in itself erroneous, narrow and insecure. Towards the settlement of this question, the scene above described—in our judgment at least—does absolutely nothing! But, it seems, there is other evidence behind. It has been discovered that Mr. Knox was subject to a distressing fluctuation of spirits; that his dejection of mind was, at times, almost insupportable; and that this heaviness of heart became more severe as the period of his dissolution drew nigh. And from these premises, the evangelical inquisitors have leaped to the conclusion that his doctrinal opinions must have been sapless, innutritious, and even positively unwhole-

some. The children of the chosen generation, it is contended, are never *lean from day to day*, in the midst of the plenty of their father's house. There is no pining or languishment with them that feed upon the true and living bread. If the soul thrives not, when provided with these measureless bounties, it cannot be but that it must have contracted a morbid liking for the poor meals of the outcast prodigal, and have been content to starve upon husk and refuse! And, truly, if the theology of the patient were as meagre and unsatisfactory as the logic and the philosophy of his judges, little would have been the wonder, had he, indeed, gradually sunk into a state of mental and spiritual atrophy. A sort of *mesenteric* decline must, we should apprehend, have been the inevitable consequence. Heaven mend the reasoning faculties of these worthy men! Their *inductive* apparatus seems to be deplorably in need of completion, or repair. Their argument is this,—a thoughtful and religious man is afflicted with fits of depression; *therefore*, his religious principles must have been insufficient for his support. Now, it so happens, that this same thoughtful and religious man was, also, notoriously blessed with many a long interval of serenity and joy; and, sometimes, experienced what may, with little exaggeration, be called “prelibations and antepasts of heaven.” What, then, is to hinder his friends from contending, quite as confidently, that he must have been in possession of the secret of that *peace which passeth understanding*. It is true, that the presumption, in either case, might chance to be fallacious. But we are quite unable to discern—(if *any* such induction is to be resorted to)—why the former of these inferences is at all more entitled than the latter, to be received as legitimate and philosophical.

Our own persuasion, however, is, that the occasional depression had, in this case, scarcely more connexion with the religious principles than the sufferings of a gouty or dyspeptic man are connected with his political principles, or with his literary tastes and habits. No person can have looked into the biography and correspondence of Alexander Knox, without perceiving that a sensitively nervous constitution, was his melancholy inheritance. He brought it with him into the world. From his youth up, he suffered its terrors, with a troubled and distracted mind. The malady, doubtless, helped to drive him from the world, and to disqualify him for *doing business in the great waters* of public life. It made him a solitary thinker, whose chief occupation it was to *commune with his own heart within his chamber, and to be still*. That his temperament, therefore, would occasionally, tinge his religion with its own dull and turbid suffusions, we can easily enough believe to be true. But, that his religion produced, or

aggravated, the melancholic complexion of his physical economy, appears to us no better than a rash and baseless hypothesis. We do verily believe, on the contrary, that, let the chief employment of his thoughts have been what it might,—whether literature, or politics, or religion,—the imperfections of his nervous structure must, still, have converted his life into a long disease. Nay, more,—we are profoundly convinced that, but for his religion, his days and nights would have been overclouded by deeper and more “thick-coming” shadows of dejection.

We do not know whether the sufferer will be allowed by the College of Physicians, who have had his case so long before them, to speak for himself, touching the cause of his own symptoms, and feelings, and experiences. But, be this as it may, the public ought to know that he *has* spoken, very distinctly, and very confidently. Hear his own words, in October 1829 :—“It is “curious,” he writes, “what a difference there is between nervousness of the severest kind, and real morbid melancholy. “Of the latter, I believe, I have not a particle. Yet, the former “brings sensations, which, while they last, are too much of the “same overwhelming nature. But then, even while they last, “they *consciously* arise from the state of the body, and the mind “feels it could be as cheerful as ever, were it not borne down by “its diseased companion.”—“I never had a thought of deeming “my interior distresses as tinctured with religious melancholy. “I have regarded my case, and do regard it, merely as a nervous “indisposition.”—“My mental discomforts are not such as to “awaken religious terrors, except *that*, of my nervous distresses “rising above patient endurance. I believe I may truly say that “this is my *sole* religious uneasiness. And this I feel only in times “of increased suffering.”—“This I will venture to say, that my “depressions are strictly those of disease; and that real mental “distress, of a religious nature, has no share in the matter. I “trust there is not a particle of religious melancholy in the “whole course of my painful feelings.”—(*Editor’s Preface*, vol. iii. pp. xxi. xxii.)

If then Mr. Knox may be allowed to know any thing of his own case, there is an end of the matter. The utmost extent of his religious depression amounted simply to this,—that, at times, he was tempted to doubt whether the misery, inflicted on him by the derangement of his nervous system, might not be almost too much for his endurance; and so, might betray him into eruptions of impatience dishonourable to his Christian profession. Precisely the same doubts might, occasionally, haunt a religious man, who might happen to be sorely tormented with rheumatism or sciatica. If such doubts indicate any thing peculiar in his

spiritual condition, they indicate, surely, the keenness of his religious sensibilities. They *can* indicate nothing relative to the soundness or unsoundness of his religious persuasion. We find, however, that previously to this period, certain persons had been on the watch for every symptom which might seem to intimate that Mr. Knox's religion was a religion of despair. That the eye of jealous observation was upon him, appears from a letter addressed to him, in 1829, by his faithful and devoted friend, the Rev. Charles Forster. "There is one point," Mr. Forster writes, "on which I have, for some time, wished to put you on your guard. It is this: when labouring under nervous depression, be cautious to whom you communicate your uncomfortable physical feelings. To our knowledge they have been misrepresented, as though they arose from erroneousness in your views of Christianity. More than a year ago, excellent ——— apprized us of a report, which had been industriously circulated among his evangelical friends, that Mr. Knox was labouring under a kind of religious despondency, owing to the unsoundness of his system; which, to use their phraseology, left him without a Saviour. ——— at once repelled the insinuation, and flew to us for authority to contradict it. This was, at once, given; and we accounted for the misrepresentation very much in the tenor of your last letter." The reply of Knox to this communication ought to set the matter at rest for ever. "The sentiments recorded in your two notes are of great consequence, as safeguards against mistake, misrepresentation, and, (it may be feared), in some quarters, too willing aspersions on the part of others. For, certain it is, you had spoken with some who *could not*, or would not understand you. From what we have heard incidentally, I have little doubt that, when beyond the reach of contradiction, those would be found in readiness who would not scruple to maintain, what they had previously circulated, that Mr. Knox had lived to repent and deplore his mistaken views of Christianity. To do this, I thank God, you have completely put out of their power; or, if the attempt were to be made, it would turn to their shame." (*Editor's Preface*, vol. iii. pp. xxii. xxiii.) From all which it is abundantly manifest that, up to this time, no shadow of mutability had passed across the writer's mind; and, not only so, but that he was disposed to resent any surmise or rumour to that effect, as something very like a positive injury and affront.

If further evidence should be thought needful, let those, who may still be doubtful, ponder the following extract of a letter, addressed to the editor by the Rev. Samuel O'Sullivan, which, although somewhat of the lengthiest, we produce the more

readily, because it does ample and splendid justice to the excellence of Mr. Knox's friend, above alluded to—Mr. Kelly. “ Without imputing to Mr. Kelly any thing more than a mistake, “ my firm conviction is, that his notion of any change of sentiment in Mr. Knox, which would imply an abandonment of the “ fundamental principles maintained by him almost during the “ whole of his previous life, is most erroneous.

“ I cannot now call to mind how nearly before his death it was “ that I saw him for the last time; but I know that, when I did “ see him last, he was so reduced that I did not think he had “ long to live; and certainly nothing then occurred which could “ induce me to suspect that any serious alteration had taken “ place in his previous convictions.

“ I remember my friend the Rev. ———, (who, at one period “ of his life, had adopted most of Mr. Knox's views, but has “ since seen reason to change them,) having mentioned to me “ that Mr. Knox either complained to him of, or exhibited in his “ presence, a want of that religious comfort under severe affliction, by which the pious sufferer is frequently sustained, and “ which amounted to a sort of confession on his part, of the deficiency of the views upon which his hopes of final acceptance “ were based. I saw my venerated friend soon after; and not “ being able to discover the slightest trace of any alteration in his “ religious sentiments, I ventured to question him closely upon “ the subject (without mentioning any name); and he denied in “ the most unqualified manner that he was fairly liable to any “ such imputation. He admitted fully the lowering effects which “ severe illness, to which he was exposed, sometimes produced “ upon him; and doubted not that he might, under such circumstances, have given expression to feelings, which zealous persons having very decidedly opposite religious convictions might “ not unnaturally have considered either as evidencing the unsoundness of his views, or, at least, his own want of perfect “ satisfaction in them. But any thing more than this he utterly “ disclaimed; and seemed glad of the occasion for impressing “ upon me, that if at any future period such a mistake should be “ made about him, I should resolve it into a similar cause; and “ not suppose that views and principles which he had studied “ and tested in every way in which the criterion of truth could “ be applied to them, while in the fullest possession of all his “ powers, could, in one moment of weakness, be utterly abandoned.

“ The truth is, that there were certain morbidly sensitive states “ of his body, in which the physical clearly predominated over “ the intellectual man. In those moments Mr. Knox was “ severely tried; and expressions might escape from him, which

“ individuals, benevolently on the watch for his conversion, might
“ regard as favouring an object which they had most sincerely at
“ heart, and in which they would have rejoiced, probably with a
“ greater joy than at any other isolated event in the Christian
“ world, by which the dealings of God with his people were dis-
“ tinguished. But, in this case, I need not tell you, they would
“ fall into a great error. They would mistake the weakness of
“ his body for the strength of his mind; and look for a com-
“ mentary upon the recorded convictions of his previous life, in
“ the querulousness of an exhausted and suffering nature.

“ Mr. Kelly I know well; and can truly say, that I do not believe
“ there lives a man less capable of swerving from the directness
“ of perfect truth, or of giving even an unduly coloured represen-
“ tation of any transaction which he may have seen it fitting to
“ record. He is a gentleman of the most boundless religious
“ zeal, and the most perfect religious sincerity, having devoted,
“ from his youth up, the whole of his energies and an ample for-
“ tune to the propagation of what he believed to be true religion.
“ He was a clergyman of the Established Church; and, had he
“ remained in it, might, at the period of the Irish Union, have
“ perhaps commanded a bishopric. But his religious persua-
“ sions to him were all in all; and for them he cheerfully, and
“ without a sigh, abandoned every earthly object, undertaking
“ the work of an unpaid evangelist, with an assiduous and labori-
“ ous earnestness that reminds one of the apostolic times; and
“ exhibiting, in his own person, an example of that composed and
“ happy serenity, which is, perhaps, after all, the clearest reali-
“ zation to the minds of men of the efficacious reception of true
“ religion.

“ Is it wonderful that Mr. Knox, who always sympathized
“ with true piety wherever he found it, should have loved such a
“ man, or delighted to hold with him at times spiritual commu-
“ nion? I think the contrary would rather be to be admired.
“ That he should have asked Mr. Kelly to pray with him, is a
“ very clear proof that he valued the man,—as who would not
“ desire to be united in prayer with an individual whose thoughts
“ are habitually in heaven? His exhibiting a readiness to join
“ in an extempore prayer, argues, undoubtedly, a certain departure
“ from the strictness of his previous practice, and may prove the
“ pressure upon his weakened frame of depressing or agitating
“ influences, such as I have before alluded to; and by which his
“ mental powers may have been for a brief moment impeded or
“ suspended. But I would no more reason from this to a de-
“ liberate change in his whole convictions, than I should argue
“ from the awful words of the Saviour upon the cross,—‘ My

“ God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me ?” to a belief that the
 “ Lord of Life was under a sense of divine abandonment, at the
 “ moment when he was taking away the sins of the world. In-
 “ deed I tremble to have touched on such sacred ground; and
 “ can only plead that I write under circumstances which afford
 “ me no time to look for any equally fitting illustration, even if an
 “ equally fitting illustration could be found.

“ After all, Mr. Knox’s religious views must stand or fall by
 “ their own intrinsic worth or weakness. They have not been
 “ received by any one *because* they are his. And by those who
 “ are truly competent to understand them, even if it should be
 “ found that Mr. Knox saw it fitting to change them towards the
 “ close of his life, they will not be lightly abandoned.

“ The clergyman who attended Mr. Knox in his last illness,
 “ and whose testimony on the subject would be quite decisive, is
 “ no more: the late Rev. James Digges La Touche. He was a
 “ gentleman who had not the slightest tinge of Calvinism in his
 “ religious views; and, I think, the very selection of him for the
 “ performance of the last solemn offices of religion, amounts in
 “ itself to a negative of the notion that there really was any change,
 “ such as that supposed, in the tenour of his religious convic-
 “ tions.”—*Editor’s Preface*, vol. iii. pp. xxxix. to xlii.

We might easily fill our pages with additional and most copious details of this *cause célèbre*; for the editor has wrought like one who had a *fire shut up in his bones, which would not suffer him to rest* until he had placed beyond all controversy the religious consistency and steadiness of the man, whose good name has been consigned to his faithful keeping. To us, we must confess, it appears, that a further exposition of the case would be little better than a superfluous labour. If any one of our readers, however, should think otherwise, we can only refer him to the ample pleading drawn up by Mr. Hornby, in which will be found exemplified all that can illustrate the character of a consummate gentleman, a single-hearted Christian, a trusty and laborious advocate, and, withal, an inflexible and devoted follower of the truth.

With regard to the difference between Alexander Knox, and the school opposed to him, if called upon for our *determination*, we should be disposed to sum it up as follows: *they* are disposed to rest their hopes mainly on the work which the Redeemer accomplished for the world, when he poured out his soul unto death. Knox, on the other hand, was never content unless he could, day by day, perceive the crucifixion of Christ exemplified within the *Calvary*—if we so may express it—of his own inmost soul. To them, the blood of Christ was the element of

life. For him, apart from the life-giving spirit, the blood possessed no healing or assuaging virtue. The molestations and persecutions of in-dwelling sin afforded, comparatively, little disturbance to them, for they were conscious of serving under a Leader who would, ultimately, make them conquerors, and more than conquerors. Knox was habitually in doubt of a prosperous issue to his Christian warfare, if he ceased, at any moment, to be conscious that the movement of his soul was heavenward. "Descent to him was adverse," and, consequently, painful and discouraging. The evangelical teachers and disciples regarded the langours and *cold fits* of faith, as so many symptoms which indicated that the "fever-balm" had not fairly made its way into the moral constitution. The patient, over whom they shook their head, was chiefly alarmed whenever the vital action of holiness, and righteousness, and purity of heart, appeared, for a season, to be stationary or suspended, if not absolutely palsy-smitten. In a word, the one party is more constantly intent on the pardoning mercy; the other, on the sanctifying grace. Now,—if this representation of the difference between these parties be a tolerably correct one,—we should apprehend that no genuine lover of peace can contemplate, without emotions of the bitterest regret, the separation into two distinct schools, which such a difference seems to imply. We are quite satisfied, at least, that the two schools might easily be made to coalesce into one, under the arbitration of an *amicus curiæ*, who should be amply gifted with the spirit of sobriety and love. It would be found, we believe, that neither of these divisions held its own peculiar principles, to the rejection or exclusion of the principles fondly cherished by the other. Both parties, we can scarcely doubt, would join in cordially embracing the two sister truths,—first, that the grace of God bringeth *salvation*,—and, secondly, that the grace of God hath appeared, to the intent that men should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world. Here, at all events, is ground on which they could not possibly refuse to meet. Some might, perhaps, be found on either side, so unhappily addicted to extremities of statement, so incapable of averting their eyes, long together, from some one peculiar *phase* of Christian truth, that all attempts towards bringing them to an agreement would be well nigh hopeless; nearly as hopeless as it would be to reconcile the conflicting witnesses in the apologue, each of whom averred that the shield they had examined was formed of a different metal. But, of such as these, we are not now speaking. We are speaking of those who have *drank deeply into the spirit* of all the Apostolic writings; of those, whose delight and glory it is to walk round the whole compass of *Zion*, and to mark *all*

her bulwarks, and to consider well, in all the varied aspects of its grandeur and its strength, the citadel of the heavenly Jerusalem. Can any man believe that if St. Paul were, at present, upon earth, and had before him the sounder advocates and representatives of each of these schools, that he would find any difficulty in bringing them to an unity? Can we believe, with his writings before us, that he would not recognize in their somewhat divergent tracks, many a foot-mark of that one and the same truth, into which he laboured, all his life, to guide the followers of the Cross? Why, then,—when we witness these symptoms of alienation between the two,—why should it be our endeavour to widen the breach? Why should we prefer to treat the case, as if it involved a deadly feud, rather than an unhappy misunderstanding,—the result of prepossessions, fostered by habit and by education, and rendered inveterate and incurable by the everlasting iteration of a school or of a coterie? We will not believe, until the evidence for it becomes absolutely overwhelming, that the rent, which we deplore, reaches down to the very foundation. We hang out, as a sign and a symbol of conciliation,—of honest and legitimate conciliation,—the faithful saying, that *there is no other name given, under heaven, whereby men may be saved, but the name of Jesus Christ*. May heaven forgive, and correct, those (if any) who imagine that we pronounce these blessed words in the spirit of unworthy compromise, or grovelling double-mindedness. We pronounce them, because we are persuaded that the grand and simple utterances of heaven,—if we have but an ear to hear,—may often do more to exorcise the spirit of controversy and dissension, than all the spells, and charms, and adjurations, which ever issued from the shrines of polemical theology.

Here, however,—we grieve to say it,—common justice demands of us the exhibition of a striking contrast between the temper of Alexander Knox, and that of the particular school to which he has been placed in opposition. We have already seen that the evangelical brethren were sorely disturbed by their alarms lest the system of Alexander Knox should have “left him without a Saviour!” Now, really, this is a surmise, to hear which, with composure, does seem to us to require a much more than ordinary measure of Christian equanimity! Let any dispassionate person open his writings at random, and peruse any score of pages,—and then let him repeat to himself the sentence,—“Alexander Knox was living without a Saviour, and in peril of dying without a Saviour!”—Alexander Knox,—whose whole life was passed in scanning the height, and depth, and length, and breadth of the grand mystery of Godliness;—whose incessant striving it was, to become rooted and grounded in love, and to

know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge;—and who could be content with nothing short of being filled with all the fulness of God. And this was the man who was to be mourned over, as one who was in perpetual hazard of losing his hold upon the Redeemer of the world! Heaven forgive us all for the aberrations of our understanding, and the perversions of our heart! It is, in truth, a fearful sight, to behold sincere and ardently devoted men betrayed, by an extremity of zeal, into an eagerness to rush into the judgment-seat, and to speak in language which sounds like excommunication. We will not imitate their example, neither shall our souls come into their secret, or be united to their counsel. We will content ourselves with saying that they *spoke unadvisedly with their lips*. For,—whatever may have been his mis-statements, or his misconceptions, upon certain points,—surely, if ever there was a man who rested all his hopes upon the work of a Divine and Incarnate Saviour, that man was Alexander Knox.

But, now let us turn to the language in which Knox was accustomed to speak of those who professed the doctrinal scheme, which, after deep and patient research, he distrusted as erroneous and delusive. Never was he heard to intimate that their system had “left them without a Saviour.” On the contrary, such was the liberality,—we had almost said, such was the flexibility,—of his scheme of thought, when engaged in meditations on the history of the Church, that he assigned a distinguished position to that very class of believers, and regarded them as honoured instruments in the hand of God, for working out his gracious counsels to their full accomplishment. He believed, or at least he reverently conjectured, that the office *providentially* assigned to them was, to preserve inviolate the foundations of the Christian economy; while the workmen, with whom *he* was labouring, were appointed to raise up the superstructure in all the strength, and all the beauty, of holiness. That their operations were conducted upon principles unknown to the purest ages of Christian antiquity, was a persuasion (as he repeatedly tells us) forced upon him by that mighty current of testimony, which the whole course of his religious studies was incessantly rolling out before him. But never did he dream that their divergency from the path, in which he felt himself compelled to tread, was such as threatened to lead them fatally astray from the fold of Christ, or condemned them to wander as aliens and outcasts from the Israel of God. Nay—so deep was his humility and self-distrust, that he sometimes appeared disposed to concede to that same school which he opposed, a pre-eminence above himself, in their consolatory apprehension of the Redeemer. On one occasion he expresses himself

thus : “ I seemed to myself to feel that, *whatever errors may be mingled with the views* of the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, they,—(the evangelical men),—when really devout, had a *cordial*, and, as it were, *vital*, apprehension of our blessed Saviour, which gave them an advantage over *me*, in a day of trial: and the attainment of which, *in a strictly scriptural way*,—(I might say, as to the substance of it, in George Herbert’s way),—would be, to me, an unspeakable happiness, in sickness and health, in life and death.” (*Ed. Pref.* p. lxx). All this while, however, (to borrow the language of his editor) “ he made the broadest distinction between their hopes, and their alleged ground of hope. He was convinced that Christ was vitally in their hearts; though he asserted, without hesitation, that the truth, as it is in Christ, was in their minds most partially, and with gross admixtures. He rejoiced to think that, the soundness of their moral constitution enabled them to thrive on food which he believed had not the full strength of life in it. He felt indeed, that, in their captivity, they had but *pulse to eat and water to drink*. But he saw that, in numerous instances, *their countenances appeared fairer and fatter in flesh than those of many of the children that did eat the portion of the king’s meat*. He saw this, and he candidly avowed it. He avowed it, at once in depreciation of himself, and, to the acknowledgment of their comparative superiority in this particular. But, in such avowal, he never lost sight of his distinctions. He confounded not a *real* effect with a *supposed* cause. He did not attribute to doctrinal influences, that which his mind had traced solely to the operation of God’s *power unto salvation*, working its blessed effects upon the ground of an *honest and good heart*.” That his language of humility and concession should have exposed him to misconstruction, can be a matter of surprise to none, who reflect upon the eagerness with which the spirit of *party*—(we use not the word with any invidious intent)—will often fly upon the adversary’s line, at any point which seems to be insufficiently guarded. Fortunately, however, abundance of defensive strength is to be found in many of his own deliberate and written statements. For instance, in 1828, he writes as follows:—“ I meant no more, by what I said of the evangelicals, as they are called, than that they have been made the chief instruments of maintaining *experimental religion* in the Reformed Churches. And, *however* this may have been done, I must think it an invaluable blessing. I did not mean to speak particularly of those who are *now* active, but of the entire *genus*. And I did not mean that I thought otherwise of them, than I did when you and I were last talking on the subject;

“but, that my own increased exigencies had made me more alive
“to the value of the *power of religion*.” (*Ed. Pref.* vol. iii.
pp. lxxxii. lxxxiii.)

Another source of misconception, extremely injurious to Mr. Knox's reputation for religious consistency and steadiness, was this,—that he never would consent to abandon the use of the word *evangelical*, when speaking of the religion of the Gospel, as it presented itself to his own heart and mind. He was occasionally heard to utter aspirations after a greater depth of *evangelical* religion. And, hence, it was inferred by certain of the so-called *evangelical* school, that he was beginning to feel the emptiness of his own system, and the substance and solidity of theirs. We are told that, on one occasion, he was cautioned, by a friend with whom he had been conversing, against the use of a term which had become “the watchword of a party.”—“What!”—he exclaimed—“give up the use of a word, because of their abuse of it! No, no;—never will I consent to relinquish it to them.” And he never did relinquish it. He continued the use of it, to the last; but never for any other purpose than to express his own unvarying sense. And, by this inflexible resistance to a narrow appropriation of the phrase, he, doubtless, assisted to extend and perpetuate the belief that he had no abiding confidence in the soundness of his own principles. The “unvarying sense” in which he understood the phrase, may be collected from his own recorded words:

“To be truly **EVANGELICAL**, is to *feel* that the Gospel is the **POWER** of God unto salvation; and, from that **FEELING**, to speak so as to make others **FEEL** their wants, and hopefully to **SEEK** the true supply. This, and not **DOCTRINE**, (to turn from Blair to others that claim that title,) is *evangelical* preaching.

“The more I read, and think, and look around me, my conviction increases that the oversight of the supreme moral purpose of the Gospel is the dominant error of the present day; and that the clouds which envelope the religious world at this time, and which, it may be feared, are producing deep and extensive delusion, can only be dispelled by ascertaining the real import of evangelical doctrine. I mean, by its being acknowledged and *felt*, that the supreme design of the Gospel is to teach us effectually to ‘deny ungodliness and worldly desires, and to live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world;’ and that (whatever other results were provided for by our Lord's death) this *moral* result is the one great end asserted by St. Paul: *that* is, not barely the *literal*, but the *greatly heightened* realization of the propounded purpose, ‘He gave himself for us, to redeem us from *all* iniquity, and purify to Himself a peculiar people, *zealous of good works*.’ I would ask, is there, in the evangelical volume, a more direct, comprehensive, definitive statement of *that* object of our blessed Saviour's humiliation and death, which

was supremely contemplated in the whole stupendous procedure?"—*Ed. Pref.* pp. lxxviii. lxxix.

So much for the question, which has been so busily agitated, respecting the stability of Mr. Knox's faith. With regard to the peculiar temperament and complexion of his theology, we have still a few amicable words to offer. It was the complaint of Mr. Knox, that he never was at a loss for listeners; but that he could seldom find any one to grapple with him, or, to use his own phrase, to *ransack* him. Such was the charm of his imaginative power,—such was his affluence of knowledge,—and such was his command of spirit-stirring eloquence,—that his hearers felt much more disposed to appear in his presence as disciples, than as disputants. His words were often received as the dictates of something little short of inspiration. If it had been our good fortune to gain admission to his familiar circle, it is most probable that the same *prestige* would have kept us dumb, and utterly disabled us for the good office of *ransacking* our instructor. Supposing, however, that we could have collected courage and presence of mind sufficient for the adventure, we might probably have been impelled to submit to him the following considerations:

In the judgment of Mr. Knox, then, (if we rightly comprehend it,) the merits of the Saviour redeemed the world from ruin, otherwise utterly irreparable. They bestowed on the human race a capacity for reconciliation with God; which, after the fall, could never have been theirs but for that sovereign propitiation. And, when men are called to a knowledge of his grace, and admitted to a participation in its privileges and blessings, the work of redemption,—which, *potentially*, has been accomplished for all mankind,—is, actually and personally, brought home to them. The attainder wrought by the primeval disobedience, as to them, is utterly reversed and blotted out; and, if adults at the time of baptism, their foregone actual transgressions are all washed away; they are brought into communion with the sovereign and life-giving spirit; and they stand forth justified in the sight of God and man. But this, their justification, is but the *initial* step in that sanctifying process, by which they are finally to be made meet for the inheritance of the saints. And from that time forward, the redeemed must cast away all confidence in the cross of Christ, unless they are conscious that the light of holiness within them is perpetually shining more and more unto the perfect day.

Now at this point it is that our doubt and perplexity arises. That the work of sanctification should be constantly progressive, is beyond all question. That no disciple of the cross should aim below perfection, is equally indisputable. But this process of approximation to the full strength and stature of a perfect man in Jesus

Christ, is, after all, a gradual process; and, sometimes, a slow and unsteady process. Like the planetary bodies, the holiness of the Christian may have its stationary points, and even its retrograde movements; and yet, it may, on the whole, be clearly and decidedly progressive. The regenerate man is not exempt from his frailties and his lapses. He may chance to stumble frequently, in his struggles along the steep and narrow way: he may, at times, appear in danger of falling past recovery: and yet it may be apparent to those who watch his goings, that his course, though painful and laborious, is, evermore, onwards and upwards. Where is the saint or the martyr who ever passed a day, without feeling the urgent need of indulgence and forgiveness? Where is the child of redemption whose approach to the confines of eternal blessedness and glory is smooth, and equable, and free from impediment and interruption? In other words, where is the regenerate man who can say that, day by day, and hour by hour, he is without sin? And here it is that another question naturally arises,—has the remission of sins passed away with the waters of baptism? Is it no more than a mere transitory absolution? Is it a privilege, whose virtue is momentary? Is every lapse and failing in the subsequent life of the Christian, to be engraven on the rock? Has the Saviour's blood no healing or absolving virtue left for them, who may still appear to be more or less afflicted with the taint of our original distemper? Now, if we were to answer these questions in the spirit of Mr. Knox's theology, we do not well see how we could do otherwise than answer them in a manner, which might send despair into many a contrite and broken spirit, and lead to the apprehension, that all, but a very minute and insignificant remnant of mankind, were, indeed, *left without a Saviour*. We speak from the *general* impression which his writings have left upon our mind; for quotations, relative to this subject, from no less than four thick volumes, would be well-nigh endless; and, if produced, might possibly lay us open to the charge of partial and insidious selection. On the whole matter, however, he does appear to us somewhat unwarrantably to identify the remission of sin, with deliverance from the bondage of sin. He is not content with considering these two things, as closely and intimately connected with each other, though, in themselves, separate and distinct. He affirms, or, at least, he plainly and pointedly intimates, that they are one and the same thing. The whole tenor of his speculations seems to imply a denial of the Christian's right to fly to the cross, when troubled with the *conscience of sin*. He, virtually, contends, for the utmost rigour of the saying, that the Christian ought not to have *conscience of sin* any more; and that, consequently, he can be in no condition to

look to the atoning blood, directly and immediately, as the propitiation for his transgressions. According to him, the blood of Christ has, once for all, given us access to the Father. Having done this, its propitiatory virtue passes away. We have nothing more to do with it, otherwise, than as we find the office of the Sanctifier, which it has purchased for us, realized in our hearts, and manifested in our lives.

Now this, we confess, does appear to us to be a somewhat fearful sound of doctrine. It nullifies, at once, the dying words of Hooker,—which are constantly in the thoughts of every humble Christian, “Lord, I plead, not my own righteousness, but the forgiveness of my unrighteousness, for the sake of Him who came to purchase a pardon for repentant sinners.” It almost deprives the word *pardon* of any meaning, except in its application to those, who are taking their first step from death to life. In short, it does appear to us to have been conceived in strange forgetfulness of the office and character of Him, who will neither *crush the broken reed, nor tread out the smoking flax*. And thus much we should say to Alexander Knox himself, if we could, at this moment, be admitted to his presence, and could muster fortitude enough to search him, and to *ransack* him. We should say to him—“You tell us that the Christian, from the day of his admission into covenant with God, to the day of his death, is in a state, which implies incessant preparation for entrance into glory. But, you cannot deny that even they who act in habitual conformity to those views, must, in moral certainty, be guilty of occasional failures and transgressions. You further must admit that every such failure and transgression, is a sin; and that without the good offices of a Mediator, *all* sin must be fatal to our hope of living for ever in the presence of God. Well, then,—if this be so, what must be the condition of the holiest man that breathes, if he should be cut off from all resort to the good offices of the Saviour? And what is it that can invest him with a right to fly to the Saviour, if it be not that Saviour’s cross and passion,—his meritorious sufferings—his atoning blood?”

Every one who is at all familiar with Knox’s writings must be forcibly struck with the confident iteration of his appeal to the Liturgy of the Church of England, in support of his own theory. And we have no doubt that he might appeal to the Liturgy, without fear of confutation, if they who differ from him would consent to rest the case upon his own selection of passages from the Liturgy! But, of course, they will *not* consent to this. They will, most untractably, insist upon appealing to their own selection of passages. And, if this privilege were allowed them, we as

little doubt that they would be able to make out as formidable a case, in their own behalf, as he has made on his. And it is further certain, that a controversy, thus conducted, would have no other advantage than that of exercising theological acumen, to the end of time. This is, precisely, the way in which the various schools of theology have dealt with the Bible. The consequences we all know—piles of polemical divinity—and catalogues of heresy and schism, the very names of which bewilder and oppress the memory. Now we, on our part, are as ready for an appeal to the Liturgy as Alexander Knox, or the stoutest of his adversaries. But then, our appeal would be to the whole of the Liturgy; just as our appeal would be to the whole of the Bible. Both the Bible, and the Liturgy (which contains the essence of the Bible in a devotional form), contain a variety of materials, out of which a mind which could delight in playing “fantastic tricks before high Heaven,” might easily set up a variety of schools. But if we contemplate either of them, in their fulness and integrity,—if we look at them in all their *phases*,—we shall find that their statements, like the antagonist muscles in the human frame, exert a corrective power and influence on each other, and that the result is, a *momentum* which carries the mind in that one direction, which leads to the throne of Everlasting Truth.

To verify this statement by reference and quotation, would be a tedious and superfluous task. Any one, with a Prayer-Book before him—we conceive—may satisfy himself of its correctness, in a quarter of an hour. The general Confession—the opening clauses of the Litany—the penitential prayer in the Communion Service—the confession in the Eucharistic office;—these, and many other parts that might easily be named,—all speak a language which seems to mutter from the dust, or to cry out of the depths. And, with these sounds of humility and self-prostration in their ears, the patrons of the *low* Divinity—(as Knox would probably call it)—might confidently ask—“Is it credible that “they, who endowed with utterance these outpourings of a “broken spirit, can have thought it safe for the Christian to avert “his gaze, for a moment, from the Cross, or to dream of safety “from the Destroyer, without an unwearied eye to the blood “of sprinkling upon their door-posts?” But then, again,—turn to other portions of our glorious offices, and especially to many of the Collects,—and, of what do they speak? Not of man as struggling in the deep and turbid waters, but of man as soaring upwards towards the tabernacle of unsullied purity, and eternal might, and ineffable sanctity. Take, for instance, that prayer of unrivalled beauty, and comprehensive power,—“Al-

“mighty and Everlasting God, grant unto us, we beseech Thee, the increase of faith, hope, and charity; and that we may obtain that which Thou dost promise, make us to love that which Thou dost command; through Jesus Christ our Lord.”—Or, turn to that supplication, of incomparably simple grandeur, and heart-stirring solemnity,—“O Almighty Lord and Everlasting God, vouchsafe, we beseech Thee, to direct, sanctify, and govern, our hearts and bodies, in the way of Thy law, and in the works of Thy commandments: that, through Thy most mighty protection, both here and ever, we may be preserved in body and in soul, through Jesus Christ our Lord.”—Here, and in various other regions of our Liturgy, we seem to be conversant with spirits, who had, in truth, cast off all filthiness of flesh and heart, in the waters of regeneration,—who had taken leave, for ever, of all the baser propensities and *lusts* of our natural *ignorance*—who had *shaken themselves from the dust*—and were impatient only to *put on the beautiful garments*, wherein they might appear, *all glorious*, in the presence of the King. And, these were the *heavenly visions* on which the eye of Knox was perpetually fixed. These were the sounds which spake to him of “deliberate valour,” and of hopeful patience, and of conquering might. He had no ear, at times, for the mournful cry of conscious feebleness, and penitential dejection. It seemed to dishonour a redeemed spirit, whose privilege it is to be in intimate communion with God’s unchangeable holiness and majesty. And, when the lofty mood was upon him, no wonder that he should appeal to the “men of might, the grand in soul,” whose lips seemed touched by the cherubim with fire from the altar.

And is there, then, we ask again—any discord between the wailings of a contrite heart, and the accents of joyfulness and hope, which denote the march of them who go forth to fight God’s battle in the strength of God? Yes—just the same sort of discord that there is between the utterances of the heavens, when in their brightness they declare the glory of God, and when, in gloom and tempest, they speak to man of God’s avenging might and irresistible displeasure;—just the same discord that there is between the oracles of God, when they tell us that God is love, and when they tell us that God is a consuming fire. Ask the faithful man, while yet he is toiling on his pilgrimage, what is the grand and vital blessing of the Christian calling? And he will answer, that it is his sense of that virtue and might which is perpetually issuing forth, from the sufficiency of the Saviour, into his own heart and spirit; and, in the power of which, he is enabled to walk according to God’s holy and undefiled law. Ask that same faithful man, when stretched upon the bed of

sickness and decay, what is the hope that brightens the chamber of death? And he will, instantly, point to the cross of Christ. For, there it was that the victory was won, which overcame the world; there it was that the followers of the cross were made conquerors, and more than conquerors; and there, too, it was, that all condemnation was blotted out against them that are in Christ Jesus, and who walk,—(with habitual, if not with absolutely unfaltering, steadiness,)—*not after the flesh, but after the Spirit*. In life, or death, then, *where is boasting?* It is utterly shut out, and done away! When the expiring Christian thinks of the righteousness that he hath done, he exclaims, “behold, this is the work of Christ that dwelleth in me.” And, when he remembers his manifold short-comings of the glory of God, what will be his cry, but that which is uttered by the voice of our Church—“O Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world, grant me thy peace! O Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon me!”

Why, Alexander Knox himself, in various parts of his writings, has distinctly confessed his own daily need of forgiveness;—in other words, his daily need of atonement and propitiation! And this confession we hold to be in perfect harmony with the noblest of his heaven-ward aspirations. But, we scarcely see, we must frankly avow, how such confession can be clearly reconciled with certain of his more hazardous and venturesome declarations, which seem to discourage the transgressor from flying, in his heaviness, to “the full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, once offered for the sins of the whole world.”

The contents of these volumes are so various, that a minute and elaborate examination of them would demand little less than a publication nearly equal in extent:—and, in many respects, they bear so strong a resemblance to those of his speculations which were previously before the world; that a lengthened disquisition would be superfluous and ill-timed. A fitter season may soon, probably, arrive, for a distinct and full consideration of his more prominent peculiarities. Mr. Faber has recently composed a treatise on the subject of justification; and Mr. Newman, as we understand, has a work in progress on the same subject. A comparison of these will, doubtless, afford fit opportunity for discussing some important points at issue between the contending schools. In the mean time, we have only to express an ardent hope that the investigation which may ensue, will, under heavenly guidance and control, advance the cause of Christian truth, without damage to that of Christian charity and moderation.

ART. II.—*The Book of the Fathers; containing the Lives of celebrated Fathers of the Christian Church, and the Spirit of their Writings.* London: J. W. Parker. 1837.

“ I HAVE seen the sun,” says Jeremy Taylor,* “ with a little ray of distant light challenge all the power of darkness, and, without violence and noise, climbing up the hill, hath made night so retire, that its memory was lost in the joys and spriteness of the morning; and Christianity, without violence or armies, without resistance and self-preservation, without strength or human eloquence, without challenging of privileges or fighting against tyranny, without alteration of government and scandal of princes; with its humility and meekness, with toleration and patience, with obedience and charity, with praying and dying, did insensibly turn the world into Christian, and persecution into victory.” This evidence to the spirit which was in the early Church is established by records beyond the reach of scepticism, and proof against the surmises which would call in question the soundness of her faith. It cannot be supposed that when the practice of Christianity was so perfect, its theory was false or defective; or that the teachers of a doctrine which bore such living fruits were themselves the dupes of ignorance or error. There must needs be in any sound-hearted religionist a feeling of deep reverence towards the Christians of those times, when the flame of devotion burnt so pure and high, that it shone as a beacon in the dark places of the world; then, if ever, the Gospel was faithfully preached, when the religion of the Cross produced its cloud of suffering witnesses, whose faithfulness, in trials the most severe that have ever been endured by flesh and blood, is our first strong assurance that the word by which we stand has in it a power beyond the malice or violence of men. It is the thought which stirs us at the mention of the Communion of Saints, the spirit that breathes in our solemn hour of supplication: “ O God, we have heard with our ears, and our fathers have declared unto us, the noble works that thou didst in their days, and in the old time before them.”

It has, therefore, appeared to us a kind of ingenuity the most pitiable and perverse, which is seen to exercise itself in assailing the credit of the early records of the Church. The writings of the Apostolic Fathers especially appeal to our Christian interest and sympathy; they have come down to us evidently bearing marks of the fiery trials in the midst of which they first saw light,

* Sermon on the Faith and Patience of the Saints.

mutilated and corrupted in some instances by unfriendly hands, in all with difficulty preserved from the treachery which, offering safety to those who would surrender their books, aimed a more subtle blow against the transmission of their religion. The simple truth, which was their utmost skill, shines through their scanty pages, and shows only the strength of God made perfect in man's weakness. It is perhaps well that it is so. For thus we are enabled to see clearly where the work of inspiration ended, to have no doubts of the fixed canon of the New Testament. What, then, can have provoked the rage of those Protestants who tread in the steps of the old Pagan adversaries, and attack the remnant they had spared? What laudable purpose has ever induced writers in modern times, professing a regard for Christianity, to bestow their diligence on such a merely destructive labour? What is the end to be secured? Is there any danger in these days of men becoming idolaters of rude antiquity, that we should so adore the primitive ways of Polycarp and Clement, as to give up our natural philosophy for theirs? Or is there any fear that in contemplating the suffering Church of the three first centuries we should be brought to recognise the same features in the persecuting Church of the sixteenth, that we should find the heretics who made the fires and those who burnt in them the same? We hear complaints that churchmen are deserting the principles of the Reformation. Is there any more fatal sign of it than this, that those who profess to follow in the steps of Cranmer and Ridley should have renounced the test by which they demanded to be tried, and, in a mistaken zeal for the naked word of Scripture, advance each private imagination above the faith of those "who bore the brunt of the conversion of the world?"*

There cannot be a study more necessary for the times in which we live, assailed on one side by theological sophists, on the other by pretenders to inward light, than one that brings us to imbibe the pure spirit of primitive doctrine, delivered by those who heard with their own ears the words of inspired wisdom, or received them from others with the gladness of a soul by truth set free. We are thus led to see that the form of Christian verity is no variable or shifting thing; but has remained from age to age, like its heavenly Author, "the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever." The good profession which Ignatius and Polycarp opposed to the sword of Pagan power; the creed which Justin held out against the philosophy by which his youth had been misled; the Catholic faith which sustained the soul of Athanasius, when "he

* Evans. *Biography of the Early Church*, p. 8.

had no friend but God and death;”* is still that spiritual food by which alone the heart is renewed to righteousness, and the eyes of the mind are enlightened to discern the mysteries of heaven. “We must still,” in the sound words of Basil, “as we have received, even so baptize; and as we are baptized, even so believe; and as we have believed, even so give glory,”† in the spirit of that good confession by which alone the God of Spirits is worthily extolled in hymns of angels, or in the congregation of the saints.

And how is the certainty of these things to be attained? If there is any principle in our holy religion which supersedes the common rules of argumentative process, or forbids that mental exercise by which in other studies we arrive at truth, there is then good reason why we should expect to be established in the faith without search into the records of past ages, and intuitively to apprehend those points “of which there was never any doubt in the Church.” But unless we believe that the Almighty supplies by miracle our natural defects, and guides us by some immediate inspiration, it is plain that no truth which we receive can be established, even to our own satisfaction, without reference to precedent. And in maintaining any truth to those that are without, as no controversy can be decided by one private opinion urged against another, the appeal to antiquity is one which no fair antagonist can refuse. Without this appeal, all question on the interpretation of Scripture is virtually at an end.

It follows that no well-instructed student in Theology can go unprovided with a knowledge of the succession of doctrine from the first ages. A strange fallacy of words and names seems to have excluded the view of a plain rule, which in no other subject could for a moment be called in question. What, for instance, would be thought of the lawyer, who should confine his reading to the statute, regardless of ruled cases and recorded opinions? Who is sufficient for these things, without use of such means, as right reason in every other science would prescribe? We have no right even to admit the claim of a disputant to argue on revealed truths, who does not come in some measure provided with this knowledge. We may say of such an one, with Tertullian, that it does not appear by what authority he has possession of the Scriptures. But if the opponent professes to have consulted the records of the past, yet still claims the privilege of judging for himself independently of creeds and councils, he

* Hooker, v. 42. 6.

† Basil, Epist. cxxv. Δεῖ γὰρ ἡμᾶς βαπτίζεσθαι μὲν ὡς παραλάβομεν πιστεύειν δὲ ὡς βαπτιζόμεθα, δοξάζειν δὲ ὡς πεπιστεύκαμεν, Πάτερα, καὶ Υἱόν, καὶ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα. See Hooker, v. 42. 8.

must expect to be told that it is a claim inconsistent with the principle of church-membership; and as the worst political subject is the man who professes to be of no party, the most hopeless heresies are those which have originated in private interpretations.

It is confessed that in this view we run into danger of the greatest misapprehensions. There are highly respectable persons ready to denounce such views as hindering the free course of the Gospel, confining the liberty of prophesying, as "betraying the truth on which alone Protestant Faith can rest,"* and "departing from the glory of the Reformation."†

What is the ground of such accusations? There appears to be a somewhat prevalent opinion, that the Reformation was a kind of first step in a science of theological discoveries—that it unfixed old errors, but fixed no truths—that it established nothing but the right of private judgment; and therefore that its principles could not stop where they began, but must necessarily make progress, and enable each successive age to go further than the preceding. Is this a correct view of what was done in our own country? for it will suffice at present to confine our view to the English Reformation. Nothing can be plainer than that Cranmer and Ridley laid down no such principles, when they helped each other to maintain "the travailing Faith of the Gospel:"‡ it was something very different from this which supported Rowland Taylor at the stake,—something far more sure and comfortable. He went, as he tells us, "in sure hope, without doubting of eternal salvation," "believing stedfastly, as the true Catholic Faith is, that Christ hath but two natures, perfect God and perfect man;" that "upon this rock Christ's Church is builded, and the gates of hell shall never prevail against it." He knew that "he had undoubtedly seen the true trace of the prophetical, apostolical, primitive Catholic Church," and was resolved that "nothing should lead him out of that way, society, and rule."§

If we appeal to their authoritative statements, the inference is the same. It is most true, that they have bequeathed to us the solemn truth, which cannot be too highly prized, that "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation." But was this the only truth for which they strove? Did they leave us to seek what these "things necessary to salvation" were? They might then have well dispensed with all the other Articles of Religion. But not content with a full statement of their own faith,

* "Brief Examination," &c., by W. Wilson, D.D., p. 43.

† "Remarks on Popery," by Edw. Bickersteth, p. 41.

‡ "Decertantem Evangelii fidem." Ridley. *Martyrs' Letters*, p. 29.

§ *Martyrs' Letters*, p. 173 & 644. ed. 1564.

expressed in the first Articles set down, or with establishing it on the authority of the written word, they at once direct us to those Catholic Confessions, in which that faith is embodied. Their spirits, weary of tyranny and reproach, were sustained by this communion of belief with saints departed. And they had surely some reason for what they did; and saw, more clearly than some who ring changes upon their names, the great end to be secured. What is it, for which we are most bound to contend;—for the principle that Holy Scripture contains all that it concerns us to believe, OR FOR THE THINGS TO BE BELIEVED THAT IT CONTAINS?—for the Ark that enshrines our Covenant, OR FOR THE COVENANT ITSELF, FOR WHOSE SECURITY THAT ARK WAS GIVEN?

Let not this be thought a subtle refinement, as if the one could not be separated from the other. In themselves they cannot; for God has appointed the written Word as the means by which he has communicated himself to man: but in the mind of the religionist they may. As the Jews could swear by the gold of the Temple, when they made the Temple itself a cage of unclean beasts; so we find, by daily experience, an apparent jealousy for the honour of the Book, where the spirit of the Book was never known.

It is clear, then, that our Reformers established no such progressive principle. They had no thought of erecting the idol of private judgment against truths to which the faith of the Catholic Church bore witness: these truths were those for which they suffered, and for which alone they have truly earned the titles of confessors and martyrs. They had no thought that the reading of the naked Word would lead the individual into all necessary belief;

“That every saint had to himself alone
The secret of this philosophic stone:”

they did not so undermine the foundations of the Christian Church; but “marked well her bulwarks, and set up her houses, that they might tell them that came after.” This it was that gave consistency and strength to the first days of the purest of Reformed Churches, which guided the pen of Hooker, the true interpreter of her charter and fundamental laws. Her outward defences rose upon the corruptions which she abolished; but her inward life and strength stood in the essential truth which she retained.

The providence of God has still preserved to us for nearly three centuries, amidst many a shock of fanatic zeal and infidel pride, the edifice which they purified and adorned. By the clue which they have left us, we may still thread the mazes of vain

philosophy, worldly indolence, and spiritual delusion. But wherever this is lost sight of, the centre of unity will be shaken, and the cause of our common Christianity must proportionably suffer.

It is not easy to imagine by what fatality so many respectable persons, not indifferent to the promotion of truth, have of late years been led so to misesteem the means by which alone such truth can be maintained: how it has come to pass that in this one point the sceptic and the pietist should have made common cause. It has been reserved for these latter days to make the defenders of primitive confessions and "forms of sound words" the mark of common obloquy; and obloquy from those who profess to hold at least the same rule of faith. There must be some deep-rooted misapprehension in all this; some popular fallacy, which has not yet been sufficiently unmasked.

The late ingenious Sir Humphrey Davy, true philosopher as he was, seems to have imbibed the vulgar opinion, when he said that there was seldom to be found sincerity in religion, without a seasoning of intolerance. If it is intolerance earnestly to maintain against gainsayers whatever commends itself to the conscience in the sight of God, this maxim may hold good; but if it respects the conduct of sincere believers towards others, as actuated by a persecuting spirit, nothing can be more false. It does not seem to have been sufficiently observed that religious persecution has ever raged most, when there was the greatest indifference to the prevalent religion. The same Athenians who applauded the irreverent buffoonery of Aristophanes, yet banished their most illustrious citizen on suspicion of mutilating a rude image of Hermes, and prosecuted the wrongs of a decayed stump of sacred olive. The old Paganism was ridiculed among the primitive persecutors of Christianity, and the zealous patrons of the Feast of Fools were they who lighted the fires of the Reformation. Wherever truth is held in a pure conscience, mercy and truth will meet together; to dream of promoting charity by indifference to truth, is to make a solitude and call it peace.

To return,—unless we join issue with the Socinians of the day, and avow that the Reformation itself was conducted on a defective principle, we must follow in the good old paths in which that great deliverance set our feet. We have, indeed, a heavy task to stand firm against the blasts of vain doctrine; and most painful is the misconception to which we are exposed from our own brethren. But when was it otherwise? The fallacy with which we are at strife is of no new date, but one which long since had in some degree imposed upon the keen intellect of Warburton. It would seem that even he was unable to explain the

principle of deference to the Fathers, which he found in the records of the English Reformation: but the fact was not then perhaps disputed; or, if it was, he saw it was too plain for controversy.

"The Reformed," he says, "though they shook off the tyranny of the Pope, were unable to disengage themselves from the unbounded authority of the Fathers; but carried that prejudice with them (as they did some others of a worse complexion) into the Reformation. They seemed neither to consider antiquity in general as a thing *relative*, nor Christian antiquity as a thing *positive*: either of which considerations would have shown them that the Fathers themselves were modern, compared to that authority on which the Reformed founded their Churches; and that the Gospel was that true antiquity on which they should repose their confidence. The effect of this error was, that in the long appeal to truth between Protestants and Papists, both of them going on a common principle, that the authority of the Fathers was decisive, the latter were enabled to prop up their credit against all the evidence of common sense and sacred Scripture."—*Introduction to Julian*.

It is singular how so acute a man should have mistaken the real question at issue. Neither side surely disputed whether *the Gospel was the true antiquity*, but what the Gospel itself was. The appeal to the Fathers was not to their authority, but to their testimony and evidence. "I take them," says Ridley, "as witnesses and expounders of the doctrine, *not as authors*." It was not, therefore, left for Daillé, as Warburton would have it, "to degrade them from the rank of judges to the class of simple evidence;" for the Reformers gave them no such dignity on the bench as he imagines; no authority, strictly speaking, at all. But as to setting *common sense* in the place of evidence on supernatural things, that is another matter: "Le sens commun," says a French writer, "est une lumière qui éclaire un horizon borné, et qui suffit pour conduire celui qui n'étend pas sa vue au loin."

It may be well here to take a short retrospect of the controversy moved by Daillé and his followers, as it seems to have had no small share in unsettling what we regard as the main principle of the Reformation.* The work of Daillé is indeed appealed

* It is remarkable what different notions the zealous Protestants of the day have of this main principle. Dr. W. Wilson has sent out his war-cry against us, in words chosen, it must be supposed, for their peculiar *historical* application: "*To your tents, O Israel*: and if you see a fundamental principle of your Church subverted, one of the strongholds of your Zion betrayed, quit you like men, and contend for the truth on which Protestant Faith alone can rest: the *absolute, entire, and full sufficiency of Holy Scripture*." Brief Examination, p. 43. Our friend, Mrs. Sherwood, it will be seen, carries out this main principle, by attacking the Eighth Article. Mr. Bickersteth, on the contrary, seems to think that the "*Articulus stantis aut cadentis Ecclesiæ*," is the belief that the Pope is Antichrist. "This," he says, "was the main reason given by our Reformers for their separation from Rome."—*Remarks on Popery*, p. 42. We should have thought it possible to maintain the sufficiency of Scripture without re-

to by Warburton, as fixing a kind of era in the fortunes of Protestantism; and however he may have over-rated its effects, as he evidently does, on such writers as Chillingworth and Taylor, of whom the one wrote before he had seen Daillé's book, the other only slightly refers to it,—yet it is of too much importance to be passed over without a more particular notice. The book itself is probably little read or referred to at present; it is not extant in any very accessible or popular form:* but its author confessedly led the forlorn hope of the detachment who were to spring the mine under the fortress of antiquity.

There is an obscurity about the Treatise "*De l'Emploi des Pères*:" and the object with which it was written is variously stated by those who are most conversant with its contents. There are statements towards the close of the book, which almost concede to the writings of the Fathers all that a candid inquirer into antiquity would demand: but the general impression on the reader's mind is, that his design was first to treat them as Father Harduin did the classics, to overthrow all confidence in the genuineness of what remains to us;—and, failing in that, by showing, as Warburton sums up his argument, "that they were absurd interpreters of Scripture, bad reasoners in morals, and very loose evidence in facts," to destroy their use in the decision of any question of Christian doctrine or Ecclesiastical practice.

Warburton, whom a kindred love of paradox seems to have inspired with a rare kindness towards Daillé, looks upon the extreme to which these accusations are urged as only a legitimate art of controversy, a bending the crooked stick the opposite way in order to restore its rectitude; but this might be more easily believed if the kind of proofs adopted by the critic did not create more serious misgivings. Nothing can be more ingenious than the mode in which times and dates, forgeries of heretics and forgeries of popes, legends of saints and legitimate history, matters of fact and matters of doctrine, are confounded together. Take from Daillé's treatise all that is irrelevant to the main question, and there will remain scarcely a tithe of its bulk. Where he comes to enumerate the actual important errors of the Fathers, in the fourth and fifth chapters of his second book, it is remarkable how, at the outset, as if conscious how little he had to justify the bold note he had struck, he

announcing the Church's Creeds; and that our Reformers were more anxious to preserve those creeds, than to have the privilege of calling the Pope by a bad name. But this notion is obsolete.

* The old English translation is done by a clumsy hand, who scarcely understood the French; certainly not the learned Thomas Smith, whose initials are appended to the preface. The Latin edition of Mettayer, Geneva, 1686, containing many additions by the author, is that which we have followed.

tells "the *candid* reader," one we suppose who was willing to take his assertions without proof, he may, if he pleases, pass over these two chapters.*

Another mark of the merely destructive object of Daillé's work is well pointed out by his learned adversary, Matthew Scrivener, that he has done much to shake the rule of faith received by Christians before him, without substituting any definite rule of his own; he may have enlarged upon the text, "Believe not every spirit," but gives little help to "try the spirits whether they be of God." His motto is,

Νᾶφε, καὶ μέμνασ' ἀπιστεῖν ἄρθρα ταῦτα τῶν φρενῶν—

a rule of acting by which many have obtained a name for wit, but one which does little service towards the establishment of any truth. Some of the heads of his argument tending this way are so singular that one can scarcely imagine them to be more than ironical, particularly where he takes a chapter to show that what we find in the Fathers is frequently not a statement of their real sentiments, but borrowed or pretended for the sake of argument. This is done chiefly by extracts from the writings of Cardinal Perron, and is an amusing specimen of the shortest mode to set aside a statement confirmed by the plainest evidence.†

It is very observable however that Daillé appears to have seen, though he is unwilling to allow, that the Anglican Reformers had a different view from his own of the use of the Fathers. "I do not deny," he says, "that some writers of high reputation among Protestants, such as Bucer, Martyr, Jewel bishop of Salisbury, and almost all of later date, appeal to the books of the Fathers in their controversial writings; but if you look minutely into their intention and design, you will find that they employ the testimony of the Fathers for the refutation of error, not for the establishment of truth—to overturn the opinions of Romanists, not to make good their own."‡ Here is a subtle distinction, but one which has no existence in facts; for it is undeniable that the English Reformers did both. Indeed it is scarcely possible to imagine how the refutation of a false opinion can be kept distinct from the establishment of the true. And we should owe but half our obligation to those willing champions who resisted the fable of Transubstantiation with the irresistible evidence of the Fathers, had they not by the same evidence established the true doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

* "Poterunt, quique sunt æqui lectores, hoc et sequens caput prætermittere," &c. 253. ed. Mettayer.

† Book i. c. vi. p. 155, ed. Mettayer.

‡ "Non nego," &c. ed. Mettayer, p. 510.

The argument most elaborately set forth against the credit of the genuineness of the patristical writings is, that the admixture of spurious matter has been so extensive as to make it impossible to distinguish what is forged from what is true: an argument which crumbles to pieces on the slightest reference to facts. He dwells much on the doubts existing as to the authors of particular treatises; and, by assigning the worst motives for the origin of such doubts, would lead us to conclude that the Catholic Fathers put out forged writings in the name of their predecessors, or corrupted the copies they had received.

Now it is by no means clear that the assignment of a treatise to a wrong author always originated in a felonious intention. An anonymous document might be circulated, especially in times of persecution, and the name of the writer afterwards be supplied by conjecture; or a treatise might bear in its title some great name, when it was only intended as a faithful summary of his sentiments. For instance, the Creed of St. Athanasius. No more blame attaches to the compiler of that Creed than to Cornelius Jansen for entitling his work "*Augustinus*." * Nor does the ascription of a wrong name destroy the whole value of a treatise. Euripides may not be the author of the "*Rhesus*," Cicero of the four books addressed to Herennius, or Tacitus of the "*Dialogus de Oratoribus*;" yet who doubts that these are productions of the several ages of Euripides, Cicero, and Tacitus, and in style and matter not altogether unworthy of their names. In the same manner it is of little consequence whether the "*Liber de Trinitate*" be Tertullian's or Novatian's; it is beyond doubt a genuine work of Tertullian's age, and a faithful record of the Catholic faith in his time. Neither has it been found that the assignment of doubtful treatises to particular authors of antiquity has impaired the credit of their genuine remains. On the contrary, the critical separation of what is doubtful or spurious has had the effect of increasing our value for those writings which abide the test; we gain by them in much the same way as we gain an author's best text out of the greatest variety of perverted

* The compiler of the "*Book of the Fathers*," like many others, talks loosely on the subject of this Creed. Whether it was written by Vigilius, or by Hilary of Arles, as Waterland seems to have proved, it is an exposition of the Catholic Faith, which has no "*spurious*" mark upon it. We have no quarrel with the compiler of this volume, though his title is somewhat ambitious; his design is good, and it may be well to exhibit extracts of primitive doctrine even through the medium of a French translation done into English:

" Ut caput in magnis ubi non est tangere signis,
Ponitur hic imos ante tabella pedes."

But in a work that "*disclaims the character of theological discussion*," it might have been well to abstain from a question so little understood.

readings. But in fact it has happened with the most questionable works of the ancient church, as with the most debateable remnants of classical literature,—those which are most doubtful are the least valuable, and, as conscious of their want of worth, they lay claim to obscure names. And as it matters little to the credit of pure antiquity who was the author of the Orphic poems, the Epistles of Phalaris, or Manilius; so it is nothing to the good fame of Augustin, Basil, or Chrysostom, to know who was the Pseudo-Dionysius, or when he wrote his mystical rhapsodies.

The only proof which could make us scruple to receive the testimony of the primitive Fathers would be, if it could be shown that they were themselves abettors of such frauds as they have charged upon the heretics of their time; that they met the forgeries of Valentine and Marcion, of the Arians and Pelagians, with counter forgeries of their own. But then this would prove too much. If we can believe that such arts were employed, it is difficult to say what warrant we can have not only for the integrity of the copies of any Father but of the Scriptures themselves, which were entrusted to their keeping. Daillé attempts to establish such corruption against the Fathers by a passage in Jerome, where he describes his own method of translating from Origen,* practised also by Hilary and Eusebius Vercellensis, taking or leaving as they pleased, and altering what they thought erroneous. But the passage proves the very reverse of that which it is adduced to prove. The works alluded to were, *professedly*, not simple translations; the plan on which they proceeded was avowed; the original was left undisturbed; and the words of Jerome prove the scrupulous exactness with which he was anxious to guard against such a misinterpretation.

The learned Mosheim has a severe remark connected with this subject, which he offers without any proof, as if the fact were notorious; it occurs in his account of the Fourth Century:

“The interests of virtue and true religion suffered most grievously by a monstrous error almost universally adopted in this century, . . . that *it was an act of virtue to deceive and lie, when by that means the interests of the Church might be promoted*. This erroneous maxim was now of long standing; it had been adopted for some ages past, and had produced an incredible number of pious frauds, to the unspeakable detriment of that glorious cause in which they were employed. And it must be confessed that the greatest men, and most eminent saints of this century, were more or less tainted with the infection of this corrupt principle, as will appear evidently to such as look with an attentive eye into

* Epist. lxii. ad Theoph. Alexandr. Daillé. p. 66. ed. Mettayer.

their writings and actions. We would willingly except from this charge Ambrose and Hilary, Augustin, Gregory Nazianzen and Jerome; but truth, which is more respectable than these venerable Fathers, obliges us to involve them in the general accusation."—*Maclaine's Transl.* vol. i. p. 310.

The solemnity of this charge should have been supported by something more than the vague generality of its terms. It is impossible to know whether it is borrowed from Barbeyrac, who had attempted something more specific on this subject. The monstrous error was of long standing too. Did it originate with the sincere Polycarp or the honest Ignatius? Against several of the names one cannot conceive on what grounds the accusation can be made, as Hilary, and Nazianzen, unless he be accused for a love he had to that shadow of a lie, called poesy. Chrysostom is left out by accident or design; yet, whoever has read the treatise "*De Sacerdotio*," might suspect he was a little playfully addicted to deceiving a friend for his good. But Augustin's doctrine on the sin of lying is surely of that gravity and strictness that it is hard to fix such a reproach on him.*

When Daillé comes to speak of the actual errors of the primitive Fathers, if we set aside those which stand on various readings, and mistaken numerals, and estimate their wrong notions of geography and natural history, common to all the ancient writers, at no more than they are worth, we shall find little to persuade us to renounce their aid in building up that good doctrine, which had grown with the growth and become linked with the very being of their souls.† A little patience in examining the passages quoted will often show us the weakness of the assailant. For instance, among many errors imputed to Justin, we find the following:

"I pray you tell me out of what part of God's word he learnt this doctrine, 'that all those who lived according to the rule of reason were Christians, notwithstanding that they might have been accounted Atheists; such as were, among the Greeks, Socrates, Heraclitus, and the like; and among the barbarians, Abraham, and Azarias,' &c. repeating the same within a few lines afterwards: 'All those who lived, or do now live according to the rule of reason, are Christians, and free from all fear and distraction.'"—*Engl. Transl.* ii. 64. Latin, 256.

We know not whether such criticism as this has led many zea-

* "Nulla omnino causa inveniri posse credatur, cur in rebus talibus mentiendum sit; quando nec ideo in ea doctrina mentiendum est, ut ad eam ipsam quique facilius perducatur. Fracta enim vel leviter diminuta auctoritate veritatis, omnia dubia remanebunt; quæ nisi vera credantur, teneri certa non possunt." Augustin. de Mendacio, § 17. And again, "Contra omnes omnium opiniones omni modo tenendum, in doctrina religionis nullo modo mentiendum." Ad Consentium, § 25.

† Αἱ γὰρ ἐν ταῖς αὐτῶν μαθήσεσι συνήξεσθαι τῇ ψυχῇ ἐνέσται αὐτῶν. Irenæus.

lous persons in later times to suppose Justin more a disciple of Plato than of Christ; or whether it is an opinion that fire will not burn out of them, that Justin wore a string of beads, on one of which he made the prayer "Sancte Socrates, ora pro nobis:" but in the mean time we will venture to translate the passage in full.

"Lest any should accuse us, as if we taught that all men who lived before the coming of Christ were unaccountable for their actions (as being without any divine guidance); we are instructed that Christ is the first-born of God, being the Word, of whom all the race of men partook: and those who lived *according to the light given to them by the Word*, were Christians, though they were reputed godless, (as the persecuted Christians of Justin's time;) as was the case with Socrates and Heraclitus among the Greeks, and others who were like to them; and among Barbarians, Abraham, and Ananias, Azarias, Misael, and Elias."*—Apol. I. lxi. pp. 97, 98, ed. Ashton.

It is plain that the true meaning of Justin is here suppressed, by the omission of the clause which we have supplied: his object is to answer a particular objection, coming probably from persons who supposed him to deny that God had made any communication of himself to man before the incarnation of Christ. He answers this in the spirit of the text of St. John, not that the old Gentiles "could be saved by the law or sect which they professed," but that the Spirit of God strove with man from the Fall, that "in the Word was life, and the life was the light of men." And in proportion as they were obedient to the light afforded them, they were partakers of Christ, who gave them all those truths of natural religion or moral philosophy which they knew.† In this sense, and no further, does he call them Christians. If, however, the name seems scarcely allowable, let him explain himself by another passage:—

"Whatever at any time the old philosophers or legislators said well or truly discovered, they worked out according to the share of invention or contemplation given them by the Word: but since they knew not all the things of the Word, which is Christ, they also often contradicted themselves."‡—Apol. II. x. p. 182.

The object of the Apologies of Justin being "to render the doctrines of Christianity as acceptable as possible to the Gentiles,"§ it was necessary for him to allow such portions of truth as he found among them a prominent place in his discourse; to

* Τὸν Ἰησοῦν πρῶτότατον τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι, Λόγον ὄντα, οὗ πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων μετέσχε· καὶ οἱ μετὰ Λόγου βιώσαντες Χριστιανοὶ εἰσι, καὶ ἄθροι ἐνομήσθησαν. . . .

† Rom. i. 19. See Mr. Evans's Biogr. p. 159.

‡ "Ὅσα καλῶς ἀεὶ ἐφθίγγαντο καὶ εὖρον, . . . κατὰ Λόγου μέρος ἐυρέστως καὶ θεωρίας ἔστι συνεθέντα αὐτοῖς κ. τ. λ.

§ Bishop of Lincoln's Justin, p. 47.

adopt their philosophical language, in speaking to philosophers, as St. Paul borrowed the verses of their poets; but he shows them how the truths which they had discovered veiled other deeper truths, and that their language was capable of a second and more spiritual meaning. This was not to philosophise Christianity, but to Christianize philosophy: he who condemns such a course of argument, only betrays his ignorance of the springs by which human nature is directed; he who suspects the single-hearted martyr of compromising the truth which he had learned, sees no further than the husk of his discourse:—

“What seem’d an idol hymn, now breathes of Thee,
Tun’d by Faith’s ear to some celestial melody.”

Of the same false doctrine Clement of Alexandria is accused, for teaching that “the Gentiles, before Christ, were *justified* by philosophy, which was then,” as he says, “necessary for them to teach them righteousness, but is now only useful for piety;” that philosophy was to them what the Law was to the Hebrews—a schoolmaster to bring them to Christ;” that “the Greeks were *justified* by it alone;” and that “it was given them as their covenant, and foundation for the philosophy which is in Christ.”*

The whole gravamen of this charge seems to have originated in Daillé’s Genevan education. Taking the word *δικαίωω*, and its cognates, to mean nothing but forensic justification, he imputes to Clement what Clement never dreamt of; it being self-evident, from the passages adduced, that he is speaking of a moral effect produced in the inner man; that such moral philosophy as Socrates taught was their best instruction in righteousness, and was a stock upon which the doctrines of grace could be more easily engrafted. That those who lived according to the rules of right reason were not so far from the kingdom of God, as outrageous offenders against those rules; and that in this sense philosophy was to them what the Law was to the Hebrews, it is surely no corrupt philosophy to affirm.

Irenæus, as well as Clement, is charged with holding, as the Church of England also holds, the doctrine of an intermediate state of the soul; and the latter for that interpretation of “Christ’s preaching to the spirits in prison,” which Horsley thought it not heretical to receive. It is perhaps a matter of pious opinion rather than an article of faith; but we see no objection to the belief, which many pious non-jurors appear to have entertained, that in the intermediate state the soul may be capable of receiv-

* The passages in the original are chiefly, Strom. lib. i. p. 99. Ἦν μὲν οὖν, πρὸ τῆς τοῦ Κυρίου παρουσίας, εἰς δικαιοσύνην Ἕλλησιν ἀναγκαῖα φιλοσοφία. And p. 117: καθ’ ἑαυτὴν ἰδιαιὴν ᾤοντο καὶ ἡ φιλοσοφία τοῦς Ἕλληνας.

ing illumination, and having such knowledge imparted to it, as may rectify involuntary errors, and prepare it for a fuller participation of the divine nature.

Daillé, holding with his friend David Blondel, had excluded from his consideration the epistles of Ignatius, and all the remains of the Apostolical Fathers. But forgetting his resolution, when an opportunity seemed to present itself for striking a blow, he calls attention, as if to the words of Ignatius, to an epistle confessedly of much later date:—

“The Fathers,” he says, “to call off our faith and affections from such things as they consider false or inexpedient, speak of them as altogether horrible and destructive: ‘If any one,’ says Ignatius, ‘fasts on the Lord’s Day or Sabbath-day, one only excepted,’ (meaning Easter eve,) ‘he crucifies Christ afresh.’ Who does not shudder at such tragical expressions? Who would not suppose that the question concerned the very foundation of Christianity? And yet it is about an observance of positive law, received, as is generally supposed, only in one part of the Church, so far from being reckoned necessary, that it was scarcely included in the first class of things probable; and which now, among the members of the Western Church, is altogether become obsolete.”*

It is singular that so sceptical an inquirer should have quoted this as a sentence of Ignatius, when, of the practices condemned, the Saturday Fast seems to have originated with Marcion half a century after the martyr’s death,† and the Sunday Fast with the Manichæans in the following century.‡ But whoever was the author of that epistle, the intention of these heretical fasts, properly understood, would have put an end to all surprise at the vehemence of his language.§

Such are a few specimens, taken casually, from the criticisms of this once celebrated work. The effect of it upon the Protestantism of the continent was doubtless unfavourable. Calvin had treated the Fathers with little courtesy, and Luther had denied the possibility of eliciting from them a consistent scheme of scriptural interpretation. But it was left for Daillé to give form and substance to those disparaging views of the early Church, which, where the bond of Episcopacy was lost, all were too ready to entertain. From that time we find little satisfaction in the notices of the age of the Fathers by the most respectable of foreign Protestants, such as Beausobre, Basnage, and La

* B. i. c. viii. p. 117. ed. Mettayer. We omit for the present all reference to Daillé’s subsequent controversy on the subject of Ignatius, which drew upon him the unanswerable animadversions of Bishop Pearson.

† Epiphani. Hær. xlii. c. 2. See Professor Keble’s note on Hooker, vol. ii. p. 533.

‡ Augustin. ad Casulan. Epist. xxxvi.

§ See Hooker, v. lxxii. 10; Beveridge, Cod. Can. lib. ii. vii. 6, 7.

Croze: with the mass they fell into neglect; the learned sometimes referred to them as stores of curious research, but none took them for guides in the science of a Christian life. The Arminians and Calvinists, however different in other points, agreed in this, that their controversy tended still further to exclude the view of primitive doctrine.

In England the depreciation was less rapid. The Liturgy still breathed its silent influence; and the pens of Hammond and Pearson, and afterwards of Bull and Waterland, still shamed an indolent generation, and rebuked the rising scepticism of their time. And no doubt the shock which the English Church had received kept alive the flame of her first love, and made her wary of rash speculations and untried systems. It was not till half a century had past, that Whitby, probably now tinctured with the Arianism of his declining years, put forth his "*Dissertatio de Scripturarum Interpretatione secundum Patres.*" In this treatise seems to be contained the first formal assertion by an English divine, that to take the primitive writers as witnesses of Catholic truth was against the sense of our Sixth Article. But the object with which this assertion was made is evident from the title of the third division of his book, "*Non posse controversias de S. Trinitate motas, ex Patribus, Conciliis, aut Traditione verè Catholica definiri.*" It was about the same time that Whiston started his absurd fancy, that Athanasius had mutilated the epistles of Ignatius, by removing such passages as were inconsistent with the doctrine of the Nicene Creed.

Barbeyrac, whose bias was sufficiently strong, speaks of this treatise of Whitby's in high terms of eulogy: "*Ceux qui ne connaissent pas encore les Pères, trouveront dans ce livre un si grand nombre de fausses explications, et d'erreurs de toutes les sortes; qu'ils en seront étonnez, et qu'ils ne pourront comprendre comment on ose tant respecter et admirer de tels écrivains.*"* More impartial judges have seen its shallowness; and lament it as one of those acts by which its author impaired the credit of his earlier writings. It seems never to have attracted much notice in this country. But the general increase of Arminianism first,† and afterwards the degenerate tone of morals, had made the old learning almost disappear; and when the base stuff of Middleton and Jortin came forth, it may seem that the destroyer's task was almost done.

The work of Barbeyrac himself, "*De la Morale des Pères,*"

* *Morale des Pères*, c. vii. n.

† What kind of theology could be expected in England, when students were directed to learn the system of their Church between Turretin and Limborch, or to oppose the errors of Popery with such a religion of negatives as may be found in Tillotson's "*Rule of Faith?*" See Bennet's *Directions*, &c.

has been noticed by Warburton and others with somewhat more respect than it deserves. It is indeed no better than what Waterland calls it, "a Satire upon the Fathers," often in a style of open-mouthed invective, not without proofs of a corrupt mind and impure imagination. The morality of the Fathers has little to fear from a comparison with the morality of such as Barbeyrac. With the reckless self-sufficiency peculiar to persons of this class, he regards neither times nor circumstances; but judges of the doctrine of Justin or Tertullian, as if they had been living in the society of the eighteenth century, or sitting in the easy chair of a Groningen Professor. The following are the terms in which he accuses Tertullian of denying to Christians the right of self-defence against an unjust aggressor:—

"Est-il possible, que, dans un Traité entier fait exprès sur ce sujet, et qui paroît un des plus travaillez de ce Père, (the treatise 'De Patientiâ,') il n'eût pas dit un seul mot, pour prévenir les impressions que l'idée qu'il donne de la Patience Chrétienne devoit faire d'abord sur l'esprit de ses lecteurs? Quoiqu'il ne faille pas attendre des anciens Docteurs de l'Eglise, et sur tout de celui-ci, toute l'exactitude d'un Moraliste, . . . je n'ai garde de croire Tertullien *si stupide, ou si emporté par son feu Africain*, qu'il n'ait pas vû que la Patience, qu'il exige d'un Chrétien, est absolument sans bornes. . . . 'Celui,' dit-il, 'qui n'a pas le courage de souffrir qu'on lui fasse perdre quelque chose ou par un larcin, ou par un enlèvement de vive force, . . . pourra-t-il aisément ou de bon cœur, se voler lui-même, pour faire l'aumône?'"*

To say nothing of the positive conclusion here drawn from negative premises,—for it is only from his silence that he argues Tertullian to have thought an appeal to a court of justice unlawful,—did the critic never hear that to the persecuted Christians all such appeal was precluded? That the treatise "De Patientiâ" was written at a time of persecution, the words which follow in the next chapter might have shown him: "*Ipsam animam, ipsumque corpus, in seculo isto expositum omnibus ad injuriam gerimus; ejusque injuriæ patientiam subimus: minorum deliberatione lædemur? Absit a servo Dei tale inquinamentum, ut patientia, majoribus tentationibus præparata, in frivolis excidat.*"† The ancient moralist knew, better than his modern censor, that human nature will rebel under petty wrongs, when it does not shrink from open violence. No doubt it was at such times often necessary to exhort those, whose constancy was prepared for fiercer trials, "to take joyfully the spoiling of their goods." But if Tertullian's African blood had carried him so far as to hold the absurd notion Barbeyrac imputes to him,—that it was

* *Morale des Pères*, vi. 33, 34; Tertullian, *De Patientiâ*, vii.

† *De Patientiâ*, viii.

unlawful to use any kind of self-defence, he would never have written his Apology.

It is scarcely possible to acquit this critic of the primitive morals of more deliberate misrepresentation, where he attacks the doctrine of the Fathers on the subject of usury; especially as his studies in ancient law must have led him to a knowledge of the real state of things, the licensed prey of man on man, under the Roman empire. "C'est une des choses," however, says he, "qui montre le plus palpablement la crasse ignorance des Pères de l'Eglise, et de leurs apologistes, en fait de droit naturel et de morale.*" His main proof is founded on a passage from Lactantius, in which, he says, "il condamne absolument le prêt à usure, et le regarde comme une espèce de *larcin*."

The passage is in Div. Institut. Lib. vi. c. xviii. "*Pecuniam si quam crediderit,*" says Lactantius, speaking of the practice of a Christian in his time, "*non accipiet usuram; ut et beneficium sit incolume, quod succurrit necessitati, et abstineat se prorsus alieno. In hoc enim genere officii debet suo esse contentus, quem oporteat aliàs ne proprio quidem parcere, ut bonum faciat; plus autem accipere quàm dederit, injustum est; quod qui facit, insidiator est quodammodo, et ex alterius necessitate prædatur.*" Here it is plain that the Christian philosopher had in view a case of Christian duty, a loan furnished to supply a brother's need; it has no bearing upon the question of lending a sum to be employed in a profitable investment. The spirit of Christian brotherhood forbids to take advantage of a brother in distress,

"for when did friendship take
A breed of barren metal from a friend."

To take interest in such a case, he says, would be little better than robbery. If this view of it appears harsh, let us remember the stern virtue of Pagan Rome. "*Majores enim nostri,*" says old Cato, "*sic habuerunt, et ita in legibus posuerunt, furem dupli condemnari, fœneratorem quadrupli: pejorem civem existimarent fœneratorem, quàm furem.*"†

Far different from this rude simplicity was the state of borrower and lender under the decline of Rome; when no salutary law checked the oppression of avarice, and the despair of suffering multitudes sometimes shook the state to its centre.‡ The Roman custom of debtor and creditor was, indeed, marked by a savage ferocity, which no heart impressed with Christian feelings could behold without horror. When Basil had seen with his own eyes the children of a thriftless parent sold in the market

* Morale des Pères, ix. 6.

‡ Tacitus, Annal. vi. 16, 17.

† Cato De Re Rustica, init.

for their father's debt, what wonder that he should compare the lender, exacting his monthly interest, to the demon of lunar madness, vexing his victim at the changes of the moon.*

Still it is not clear that in their condemnation of usurious practices, the Fathers meant to condemn all beneficial employment of a Christian's private wealth. What the law of Justice demands is surely not, as Barbeyrac would have it, that every man should be free "d'accorder son propre bien à telles conditions que bon lui semble:" but that he should have the power of lending it out for as much and not more than it is worth. This is the end of the usury laws, not yet abolished, and hitherto found necessary in all well-governed states, to protect the lender while he does not bargain for a usurious rate of interest, beyond the average increase of his capital otherwise employed. As far as the Fathers speak specifically on the subject, they seem to have had no other view of usury. A canon of the Council of Nice prohibits the clergy from lending on interest;† but the interest specified is the *centesima*, and the fifty per cent. (ἡμιόλιος τόκος) on agricultural produce, condemned also in a strong passage by Jerome,‡ and afterwards reduced by a law of Justinian to the proportion borne by the *centesima* to the whole. Where the laws allowed even so high a rate as this, it cannot but appear that the Church did right to exert her vigilance to keep her children within the licence of the statute; and this end it was well to secure, if it could be done by no other means, by forbidding them to lend on interest at all.

It cannot but strike a reader of this satirical censor, that almost all his objections are against the excess of moral extravagances in the Fathers, not for the defect of right principles. His narrow line and rule applied to their pages of glowing eloquence remind one forcibly of Madame de Stael's twofold division of humanity, "ceux qui sentent l'enthousiasme, et ceux qui le méprisent." Where he is most candid, he judges of them as the stage-critic, who measured Garrick's tragic pauses by looking only at his stop-watch.

The treatise of Barbeyrac, moreover, abounds with dishonest quotations. It will suffice to point out the following:—

"Justin parle de ceux d'entre les Chrétiens qui se denonçoient, et s'alloient eux-mêmes offrir au martyre: mais bien loin de donner aucun indice qu'il désapprouve ce zèle outré, on peut inferer qu'il l'approuve de ce qu'il dit dans un de ces passages. Il se propose cette objection: 'On nous dira peut-être; Puisque vous voulez tant mourir, pour aller à Dieu, tuez-vous tous vous-mêmes, et ne donnez plus d'occupation à nos tribu-

* Basil. Homil. in Ps. xiv. (xv.)

† Concil. Nic. Can. xvii.

‡ Comment. in Ezekiel, vi. 17.

naux.' Que répond Justin à un tel raisonnement ? Il ne nie point le fait, ni ne blâme l'action ; il se contente de nier la conséquence. 'La raison,' dit-il, 'pourquoi nous ne donnons pas la mort à nous-mêmes, c'est que nous avons appris que Dieu n'a pas créé le monde en vain, mais pour l'amour du genre humain, &c.'" . . . On peut inferer de là, que Justin ne regardoit pas un Chrétien comme véritablement cause de sa mort, lorsque, par un désir mal réglé du martyre, il s'y va offrir de lui-même."^{*}

Will it be believed that the whole of this charge is founded on the suppression of a little clause in the first sentence referred to, "That no man may say," says Justin, "Kill yourselves and go to God, and do not give us the trouble, I will state the reason why we do not this, and also *why, when questioned at your tribunals, we fearlessly confess that we are Christians.*"† He has just been speaking of the case of Lucius, a Roman martyr, who had presented himself before the prefect, not to denounce himself, but to intercede for a Christian friend ; but, being himself questioned by the prefect, had confessed that he also was a Christian, and shared the death appointed for his friend. This is all that Justin defends: he says nothing in approval of a voluntary self-accusation ; but he did not hold that the denial of their Christian profession, when they were "brought before kings and rulers," was one of those "menteries innocentes," which his censor believes the Fathers to have generally approved.‡ His criticisms are equally candid, where he calls Cyprian to account for the same *ill-regulated desire of martyrdom.*§

Since the appearance of the flippant Remarks of Jortin, the controversy on the Fathers had been lulled in a deep repose. The few gentle spirits, who loved the primitive ways and order, and the forms of primitive consent, pursued their course undisturbed by the strife of tongues ; but among all the currents of popular doctrine, there was none which turned the public attention to the forgotten article of Faith, "I believe in one Catholic and Apostolic Church." The time has now come, we confidently trust, when we may look for the revival of better principles and deeper knowledge. The venerable men, who have seen what "the glory of the first house" was, have lived to see a love for the old theology revive. The "Library of the Fathers" is in the hands of editors, whose names are a warrant for a judicious and faithful restoration of the stores of antiquity. "The *hacknied*

* Morale des Pères, ii. 8.

† "Οὐκ ἐστὶν οὐδὲν ἄλλο, Πάντες ἴνα ἑαυτοὺς φονεύσαντες πορεύεσθε ἤδη παρὰ τὸν Θεόν, καὶ ἡμῶν πρᾶγμα μὴ παρέχεται, ἰεῶν, δι' ἣν αἰτίαν τοῦτο οὐ πράττομεν, [καὶ δι' ἣν ἐξεταζόμενοι ἀφ' ἑωυτοῦ ἡμεῖς.] Apol. II. iv. p. 167, ed. Ashton. Barbeyrac appends the passage to his text, with the omission of the clause between brackets.

‡ Morale des Pères, xiv. 7.

§ Ibid. viii. 40, etc.

rule of Vincentius," as Dr. Hampden calls it, is again heard of in the Oxford schools ; and long may it animate the scene where Ridley first called it to his aid !

Of regular assailants of the Christian Fathers, we now hear of none, or none of any name and reputation. It is true there is a Mr. William Osburn, of Leeds, we believe, who has put forth a full volume on the "Doctrinal Errors of the Apostolical and Early Fathers;" and, indeed, he has picked so many holes in their tattered garments, that how they will ever be mended to his satisfaction cannot be imagined. He is an opponent too, of whom it is apparent that he is no novice in the science of dispute.

"Well hath he learnt the grammar, and the logic
And rhetoric of debate ; his method all
Drawn out in tables and in scales, shall make you
Able to quarrel at a straw's breadth by moonlight."

No Pharisee could be more angry at a false measure in his tithe of mint, and anise, and cummin, than Mr. Osburn with the Fathers for not adapting their words and phrases to the capacity of his peculiar sensorium. Yet it must be confessed this would have been a difficult task. St. Hermas has said, in Wake's translation, p. 393, "God is not as men, mindful of the injuries he has received ; but *he forgets injuries*, and has compassion upon his creature:"* a passage of which Mr. Osburn observes, "it would be hardly possible to display more consummate ignorance, not only of the nature of prayer, but of the whole scheme of Christianity." "We deny," says he, "that the sinner has any ground of hope in *the badness of the Divine memory*: God does not, cannot, *forget* any thing."† Only imagine what a ferment would have been raised in Mr. Osburn's mind, had he for the first time read in some ancient Father the solemn words of the new Covenant, "*Their sins and their iniquities* WILL I REMEMBER NO MORE."

That we may not, however, be accused of unfairness to the latest censor of the Fathers, we will take the first passage which presented itself on opening his volume ; he is accusing the Apostolical Fathers of claiming an inspiration for their writings:—

"They mistook," says he, "their own mental emotions for the impulses of inspiration. St. Barnabas concludes his well-known comment upon the ceremonial law, thus :—'But how should we know all this, and understand it? We, understanding aright the commandment, speak *as the Lord would have us*. Wherefore he has circumcised our

* Hermas, lib. ii. mand. ix. On comparing the Latin, or the Greek of Antiochus, it will be seen that Mr. Osburn's examination did not extend to the originals. The words are "immemor injuriarum," and ἀμνηστία, neither of which expresses simply an act of memory.

† Doctrinal Errors, &c., p. 120.

ears and our hearts, that we might know these things.' This bold avowal of inspiration is made in favour of *a tissue of obscenity and absurdity which would disgrace the Hindoo mythology*: though in the same epistle the writer entirely disclaims it for the pious and scriptural train of reasoning with which he commences.

"Ignatius makes a similar general disclaimer of inspiration. He experienced no necessity for it so long as his sentiments were in accordance with the teaching of the Apostles; but when he inculcates *his wild extravagant notions of subjection to the Christian hierarchy*, he becomes inspired. 'Some would have deceived me according to the flesh; but the Spirit being from God is not deceived. I cried while I was among you, I spake with a loud voice, Attend to the bishop, and to the presbytery, and to the deacons. Now some supposed that I spake as foreseeing the division that should come among you; but He is my witness for whom I am in bonds, that I knew nothing from any man; but the Spirit spake, saying on this wise, Do nothing without the bishop.'"

"The mental process," says Mr. Osburn, "by which these good men were deluded is not very difficult to analyze; both were evidently conscious that the doctrines they advanced did not rest upon a very firm basis of Scriptural authority: but they nevertheless entertained towards them *that kindly parental prepossession, against which every one who commits his thoughts to writing ought to be upon his guard; they were elated with the idea of having struck out something clever and original*, and this emotion they mistook for the inspiring influences of the Holy Ghost." —*Doctrinal Errors*, &c. pp. 25, 26.

We shall say nothing to Mr. Osburn's notions of Hindoo mythology, wishing him only an ounce of civet, to sweeten his imagination: nor to his notions of subjection to the Christian hierarchy;—it is a matter which does not enter into his constitutional system. But we must beg of him to look with us at the text of these two Fathers, lest he should go on, like Judge Minos, to sentence first, and then to hear.

The author of the epistle of Barnabas, so far from claiming a private inspiration in the passage referred to, *does not speak of himself individually at all*. He is speaking of Christians in general, as being able to see a typical sense in the ceremonial law, which the Jews could not see; a sense which the Epistle to the Hebrews would point out generally to any attentive reader, whatever may be thought of the further application of the principle to those things enumerated by the author of this epistle. Those who received the Christian Scriptures saw how the ceremonial law was "a shadow of good things to come;" the Jews could not.

"How should *they*," says the primitive writer, "understand or comprehend these things?" (not "*we*," as Mr. Osburn has it from Wake). "We Christians, rightly understanding the commandments of the ceremonial law, speak of them as the Lord intended them; for this reason He

has circumcised our ears and our hearts, that we may understand these things."*

That this is the sense of the passage is evident from what is said a little before in the same epistle, where he has been enlarging on the typical sense of the Jewish sin-offerings :—

"The ceremonies there used," he says, "are clear to us, but dark and obscure to them : because they have not heard the voice of the Lord."†

As to Ignatius, he not only does not claim inspiration in the passage quoted, *but actually disclaims it in that very passage* :—let us see :—

"Though some," he says, "wished to deceive me according to the flesh, yet the Spirit is not deceived, being of God : for it 'knoweth whence it cometh and whither it goeth,' and 'reproveth the secrets of the heart.' I cried out while I was with you, I spoke with a loud voice, 'Give heed to the bishop, to the presbytery, and the deacons.' Some suspected me of saying these words because I had known beforehand that there was a spirit of division manifested by some. But He is my witness for whom I am in bonds, that I knew it not from any living man. But the Spirit preached by me, saying, 'Do nothing without the bishop ; 'keep your body as the temple of God ; love unity ; avoid divisions ; be ye followers of Jesus Christ, even as He is of his Father.' I, therefore, did my own part only as a man who was prepared to preserve unity."‡

It is plain that the good bishop here pretends to no inspiration,—on the contrary, he declares that he spoke as a man, taking only such topics as it became a ruler in the Church of Christ, and one who tendered its prosperity to insist upon ; but that the Holy Spirit, *whom some Christians still believe to breathe upon the ministrations of the word which He gave*, directed his preaching to an application unknown and unsuspected by himself. It is a passage which may seem to magnify the ordinance of preaching ; but the "parental prepossession" felt by an author who has "struck out something clever," be it where it may, is not to be found in the text of Ignatius.

After this specimen of two mis-translations on his first page, the reader will probably agree with us, that we may leave Mr. Osburn to go on cursing his own shadow for a traitor ; he may be considered to be *hors de combat*, as far as concerns the interpretation of the Fathers.

Enough, indeed, has been said to show the ease with which

* Barnab. Epist. x. ad fin. Πόθεν ἐκείνους ταῦτα νοῆσαι, κ. τ. λ.

† Epist. Barnab. viii. ad fin.

‡ Epist. ad Philadelph. vii. In the words, ὡς προσιδότα τὸν μερισμὸν πᾶν, Ignatius does not mean that they suspected him of foreknowing some future event by a prophetic revelation, as Wake somewhat absurdly takes it, but of being informed before his coming to Philadelphia of the actual state of the Church there.

minds of a certain bias will admit the most preposterous charges against those whose memory they do not love. Enough, we hope, to show, that there are no reasons yet urged of sufficient weight to make us think the ancients are, like the superannuated Romans,* to be thrust off from the bridge end, or all to be exported to America, where our brethren of the Protestant Episcopal Church understand their value. We wish this humble effort might serve to remove some portion of the unhappy jealousies that still prevail; that it might first of all direct the eyes of Churchmen to see where the hidden power of the Church of England lies, that her defenders may not go forth to the contest with armour that they have not proved, nor rob themselves of those essential graces, which are to them not the marks of comeliness, but the secret of their strength. And, after taking the concurrent voice of antiquity as the sure guide to all fundamental truth, that they may not think scorn of those who have committed it to faithful records, who, though men of like frailty with themselves, yet witnessed unto blood the good confession in times more perilous, or who, when the churches first had any space of rest, laboured to make known the way of righteousness with a zeal and diligence which no later age has equalled. Let it be considered how little we should know of the interpretation of Scripture without the works of Origen, of Tertullian, of Chrysostom, of Basil, of Hilary, of Augustin, and of Jerome. Is it not a fact which cannot be disputed, that the Reformation itself received its impulse from the revival of the study of the Fathers?—that this arsenal supplied Ridley and Cranmer with those good weapons whose ethereal temper forced falsehood to disclose itself in its own likeness? And is it not some solace, amidst the changes of an uncertain world, to have communion in the ways of truth with the spirits of just men made perfect, to know that we are not without a centre, but part of one great system revolving round that Sun,

“Whither as to their fountain, *other stars*
Repairing, in their urns draw *golden light*.”

Rooted and grounded in these studies the Christian student finds a depth and compass in the divine word, far different from the shifting interpretations learnt in the diluted theology of later days: he can range at liberty in large pastures, undisturbed by the watchwords of party, and be satisfied with the waters of comfort, which come down fresh and pure through soils nurtured near the springs of the Eternal Fountain.

* “*Video quosdam, præ novis libellis, veteres auctores fastidire in tantum, ut et Origenem et Hieronymum, velut sexagenarios, quod est in proverbio, de ponte deturbandos existiment.*”—*Erasmus, Pref. in Hilar.*

- ART. III.—1. *A Sketch of the History of the Church of England to the Revolution, 1688.* By Thomas Vowler Short, B.D., Student of Christ Church, and Rector of King's Worthy, Hants. 2 Vols. Oxford.
2. *The Life and Times of Richard Baxter.* By the Rev. William Orme. 2 Vols. 8vo.
3. *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of John Owen, D.D.* By the Rev. William Orme. 8vo.

AN impartial history of ecclesiastical affairs in this country from the period of the Reformation is still a desideratum in English literature. Southey has done much in his admirable work; but the absence of all references to authorities detracts considerably from the value of his excellent performance. This circumstance has also afforded a handle for cavil to the enemies of our Church, who hesitate not, in consequence of the omission which we sincerely regret, to impugn the truth of his statements. The work of Mr. Short, though valuable as an abstract, is not, perhaps, quite equal to his well-earned reputation in the university of which he is a distinguished ornament. Dissenting writers, from Neal down to Mr. Orme, have dwelt largely in their respective works on the ecclesiastical history of our country; and while on the one hand they have, by their combined efforts, endeavoured to represent Dissent in the most attractive light, they have not failed on the other hand, with the most surprising uniformity of consent, to misrepresent and abuse the discipline and ceremonies of the Church of England. Yet it is through such distorted mediums that the dissenting community are accustomed to receive their impressions of the ecclesiastical history of the period. Neal's prejudices and uncandid statements on all subjects connected with the Church of England are notorious; and the man who forms his estimate of the characters and proceedings of the bishops and others who flourished during the reigns of Elizabeth, James, and the first Charles, from his pages, will arrive at conclusions totally at variance with the truth of history. Yet by many persons Neal is quoted and appealed to as an impartial historian. The man who is anxious to obtain a clear view of the state of the Church during the period extending from the commencement of the Reformation to the accession of James I., must consult the accurate and laborious Strype, who was too honest not to state facts with the strictest impartiality, and whose labours are a rich mine to the ecclesiastical historian. It is a subject of deep regret that no one has been found to collect and arrange materials for the history of the Church in the subsequent reigns to the time of the Revolution.

The controversies between the Papists and the Church, as also between the latter and the Puritans, would, if detailed with candour and impartiality, form an interesting chapter in our ecclesiastical history. To the controversies alluded to might be added the disputes among those various sects into which the body of the Puritans became divided subsequent to the death of the first Charles. The controversies of any particular period not only mark its character, but are a kind of landmark to the historian in his researches. Ample materials might be gathered from the controversial writings of the period to which we allude: the works of Jewel and others at and subsequent to the era of the Reformation open a copious source of information on the Romish controversy; while those of Cartwright and Whitgift may be consulted with equal advantage on those questions on which the Church and the Puritans were at issue. Almost every half-century has been marked or characterized by its peculiar controversy, which, though now forgotten, was of absorbing interest at the time; and which, though devoid of interest to general readers, must be thoroughly understood by those who would form an accurate estimate of the state of religion. The puritanical controversy might indeed be brought to bear with considerable effect on the questions at issue between Churchmen and Dissenters. It is the custom with the latter to boast of the antiquity of the congregational system,—the system adopted by all the numerous sections into which Dissenters are divided; they boldly affirm that no other mode was practised in the Church prior to the time of Constantine. Experience proves that nothing is so likely to secure the belief of the multitude in any particular statements as the assumption of a bold and fearless tone: and of the truth of this position our dissenting writers seem fully aware; knowing that by the multitude strong assertions are taken for arguments, and that the greater the assurance with which the assertions are made, the greater credit do they obtain with superficial observers. It must be total ignorance on the subject, or a total disregard to truth, that leads the Dissenters to claim such high antiquity for their system; nor can any other reasons be assigned for the universal reception of such erroneous statements among the members of the dissenting community. Congregationalism, or the independency of each congregation, was certainly unknown in the apostolic age; it was unknown to the Church during the space of fifteen hundred years subsequent to the death of Christ; nor was it ever heard of until Robinson, Brown, Ainsworth, and others, separated from their puritanic brethren; it was the offspring of those excesses which arose after the Reformation; and though now universally practised among modern Dissenters, it was denounced by the Puritans

even as a dangerous heresy. It has not, notwithstanding the assertions of Dissenters, any more foundation in Scripture or antiquity than those other novelties of the same period which sprang from the same source, and which, after a short-lived existence, sank into decay, and are now remembered only as matters of history.

Mr. Orme hesitates not to claim the authority of Scripture and antiquity for the system of independency; nor do any of the dissenting writers of modern times shrink from similar pretensions. There doubtless was more than one congregation in Rome, in Corinth, and in other cities and countries in which the churches, addressed in the apostolic epistles, were planted; yet St. Paul addressed his epistles to all of them collectively forming the Church in Rome, or in Corinth, or in any particular place. In all cities and states the congregations, however numerous, were under one kind of government, and one particular mode of discipline,—they were all united together into one body as the Church; yet, according to the principles of modern Dissent, there may be many distinct churches in one city varying from each other in worship and discipline. The Dissenters are, however, constrained to acknowledge that independency was unknown in the Church from the age of Constantine down to the seventeenth century; a circumstance, in our opinion, conclusive on the subject, and decisive as to the mode of government previously existing; for it is scarcely possible to believe, that if independency had been the system adopted in the apostolic age, there would have been at such an early period so wide a departure from primitive simplicity. We can hardly believe it possible for a Dissenter to suppose that the primitive and apostolic platform of discipline should be buried amidst the innovations of the fourth century, and not be again heard of in the history of the Church until its resurrection in the seventeenth; yet such is the avowed belief of Dissenters. How can we account for these things? We are acquainted with a gentleman, once a Dissenter, though now separated from his former friends, who has often assured us, that many Dissenters take matters upon trust, and believe, on these subjects, whatever is told them. He mentioned himself as an illustration of his assertion. He stated that he once believed that it was not lawful to baptize infants, and he firmly believed, though he had never examined the subject for himself, that there was no mention of infant baptism in the writings of the fathers prior to the fourth century. This belief was grounded on the assertions to that effect made by his party both in books and in conversation. Being, however, a man of considerable powers, it struck him that he ought not to rest satisfied with bare assertions, but examine for himself. The result was a total change of views on this subject,

for he discovered that the writings of the earliest fathers contained numerous traces of the existence of such a practice in the apostolic and succeeding ages. Now we feel assured that many Dissenters are exactly in the same position relative to the subject of church government; like him they take things upon trust, and give credit to the assertions of others without examining for themselves. When the system was first broached by Robinson, Jacob, and Brown, it was denounced by all the leaders of the Puritans as an unscriptural and dangerous novelty. Let the question be carefully examined, and we feel assured that, in the estimation of impartial judges, it will be found to be wholly destitute of any foundation in the word of God or in the writings of the apostolic fathers. But how very few Dissenters are willing to sit down to an examination of the subject!

The volumes of Mr. Orme are extensively circulated among Dissenters, and his assertions are received as undisputed facts by the great mass of his readers. We feel it, however, to be our duty to warn the public against his erroneous statements; for his strong prejudices on all those subjects connected with the discipline of our Church are so conspicuous on almost every page, his hostility to our establishment is so inveterate, that he cannot be considered a safe guide through that stormy, yet interesting portion of our history embraced in these volumes. In vain shall we search for moderation or impartiality in his pages. The two works may be viewed as a history of the times during which Baxter and Owen flourished; for these two individuals were beyond all comparison the most eminent and distinguished of their party, and acted a conspicuous part in the proceedings of that eventful period.

Mr. Short commences his history with the introduction of Christianity into England; but a very brief space is occupied with the period prior to the Reformation. The Reformation was one of the most important events of modern times; it is not, therefore, surprising that many pens have been employed on the subject; nor, indeed, is it strange that various and discordant opinions should have been formed on the characters of its principal actors. By the Papists the work itself, as well as the individuals by whose instrumentality it was effected, are denounced without scruple; and even by some Protestant writers the great men who were so instrumental in its accomplishment, have been treated with unbecoming severity. Though the characters engaged in any particular work reflect neither credit nor disgrace on the work itself, yet as many Roman Catholic writers labour to represent the Reformers in the most odious light, it becomes the duty of those who value the blessings secured to us by the Reformation,

to defend them from unjust charges, and to vindicate their memory from unfounded calumny. We think that Mr. Short has scarcely done justice to the character of Henry VIII. We do not wish to become the advocates of the king; but even the memory of Henry ought not to be loaded with unmerited reproaches. Speaking of the divorce, Mr. Short observes,—

“It is even probable that the existence of the scruple preceded the affection which Henry bore to Anne Boleyn; but neither of these points is of much importance at present, though they have been discussed as if the character of the Reformation depended on the principles which actuated those with whom it originated. Of the sincerity of Henry’s religious scruples, and the real tenderness of his conscience, there can now remain no great difference of opinion; if all these particulars were established in his favour it would probably produce no great change in our sentiments concerning him.”—vol. i. p. 130.

In allusion to the same subject, in a note, Mr. Short remarks, “The Roman Catholics may reject him, but Protestants will hardly claim him as their own.”—vol. i. p. 136.

We must repeat our doubt, then, whether justice is done to the character of the king by Mr. Short. Why should he speak of Henry’s scruples, as if there was any doubt of their existence prior to his affection for Anne Boleyn? Even Rapin, though by no means prejudiced in favour of Henry’s reputation, admits that the king had not seen Anne when the subject was first brought under discussion. It is well-known that Henry bestowed deep attention upon theological subjects; and the marriage of a brother’s wife was just one of those topics to which, in such an age, his attention would have been directed. We see, therefore, no reason for believing, and especially in the face of opposite evidence, that affection for Anne Boleyn and not religious scruples originated the divorce.

Among the evils connected with the Reformation we are disposed to place as one of the greatest the alienation of the monastic property. On this subject our opinions are at variance with those of Mr. Short. He approves of the suppression of the religious houses; and intimates his belief, that had they been permitted to exist they would have impeded the Reformation. In this sentiment we cannot altogether concur; for though the monastic establishments had been preserved, it does not follow that they might not have undergone a reformation, and have been placed upon a foundation, so as to have served the cause of religion and of learning, and have rendered that support to Protestantism which they had formerly contributed to Popery. We recollect that, in the fervour of religious zeal by which the Scottish Reformation was distinguished at its commencement, it was pro-

posed to pull down the churches as buildings that had been polluted by idolatrous worship ; and the only argument used on the occasion was this,—“ We must pull down the nests or the rooks will again return.” It appears that Mr. Short entertains some opinion of this kind relative to the monastic establishments : he appears to imagine, that in some way or other their continuance would have proved a barrier to the progress of the Reformation. We, however, hesitate not to avow our regret at their suppression ; at all events the property ought to have been devoted to ecclesiastical purposes. It would, indeed, have been far better to have preserved them in their original state, making, of course, such alterations in their constitution as the Reformation in the Church would have rendered necessary, than to have squandered their property on needy and rapacious courtiers, whose only motive for advocating the suppression was the hope of sharing in the spoils. Much of this species of ecclesiastical property is still held by the descendents of the very men to whom it was originally granted ; and as some of these individuals have recently advocated, both in and out of Parliament, the principle, that the property of the Church may be appropriated to other purposes by the state, they are bound in justice to admit the same claim in reference to that portion of their present possessions, which has been derived to them from the monastic establishments, and which is exactly of the same description with that still held by the Church of England. Let the principle be applied to all property that was at any time ecclesiastical, and we shall hear no more from the individuals in question of the appropriation by the State of the property of the Church.

The disputes by which the peace of the Church was broken subsequent to the Reformation are well known to the readers of ecclesiastical history. They had their commencement in the scruples of Hooper, who was selected by the young king, Edward VI., to fill the see of Gloucester. In his estimate of this original dispute, we cannot but think that Mr. Short's opinions are unsound.

“ The dispute was an unfortunate one, being the first of a series which for years agitated our Church ; but on a calm examination of the subject, at a period, it is to be hoped, that such indifferent matters may be viewed without prejudice, it must be granted, that though the distinction of ecclesiastical dress appears in itself to be useful, yet it may seem too that the policy of the government would have been wiser had they left Hooper to his own conscientious scruples, and found some other divine, who, without possessing less sincerity, was not so strongly bent on following his own opinion in trifles.”

We observe, that the king insisted on the elevation of Hooper,

and it would therefore have been a dangerous precedent either to have yielded to his scruples, or to have permitted him to remain in a private station, simply on account of his objections to the Episcopal habits, when once the appointment had taken place; for it should be remembered that Hooper had been actually nominated to the see, and his scruples were not disclosed until the arrangements for his consecration were in progress. Had his scruples been regarded, it would have been scarcely possible to avoid similar concessions in the cases of others, whose objections might have been of a different kind. It would, indeed, have been wiser not to have contemplated his promotion; but it appears that prior to the preparations for his consecration the existence of such scruples was not known. It is probable that Hooper's friends may have deemed his treatment severe; yet, under the circumstances in which the Reformers were placed, it would have been difficult for them to have acted otherwise.

On the subject of our articles our views coincide with those of Mr. Short, who combats the notion so industriously propagated by certain Churchmen, that they were intended to be articles of peace, and not a standard of faith:—

“There is no historical evidence to confirm an idea not unfrequently entertained, viz., that they were drawn up for the sake of promoting peace and tranquillity, and as a compromise of opinions rather than a standard of faith. We shall perceive in them a desire to avoid curious and unprofitable questions, as well as to leave disputed points to the judgment of the individual; and undoubtedly several of the articles are so framed, that conscientious persons, holding different sentiments, may safely subscribe to them; but latitude of interpretation, which is suited to the weak and doubtful, cannot be granted to those whose decided sentiments are at variance with the plain and grammatical sense of the formularies of our Church.”—vol. i. p. 276.

The authority of Paley has undoubtedly been instrumental in fostering the notions censured by Mr. Short. Should it be allowed that the articles were merely articles of peace, the safety of the Church would be endangered; an inlet would be opened through which individuals of the most heterodox sentiments would enter into the vineyard. We hope, however, that such a view is maintained but by very few members of our establishment; of this fact, indeed, we are certain, that persons maintaining such an opinion act in opposition to the very spirit and constitution of the English Church.

Our author asserts, that Cranmer's views on the question of Church government were Erastian. It is also his opinion that an Erastian could subscribe the XIXth, XXIst, and XXIIId Articles. (vol. i. p. 293.) At that time the unlawfulness of Episcopacy

had not been broached; hence the Reformers were not called upon to state their views with precision on such a question. It is, however, certain that they entertained no kind of doubt on the subject; and if Cranmer and some of the other Reformers have expressed themselves with less decision than could have been wished, or in such a manner as to give the semblance of support to the Erastian theory, we must not forget that they had just cast off the authority of the pope, and were in consequence disposed to allow too great an influence to the civil power in matters ecclesiastical. But even granting that on some points they expressed themselves agreeably to the Erastian theory, we cannot discover in the articles and formularies of our Church any passages which can in any way be construed so as to support that system. That Episcopacy was the mode established by the Apostles, and continued in the Church without interruption during the long space of 1500 years, is a fact that can scarcely admit of question; but that there can be no supposable case, in which another mode of government could exist, is not asserted by our Church. On this subject we quote the following observations from an eminent prelate:—“Though I flatter myself that I have proved Episcopacy to be an Apostolic institution, yet I readily acknowledge that there is no precept in the New Testament, which commands that every Church should be governed by bishops. No Church can exist without some government. As it has not pleased our Almighty Father to prescribe any particular mode of civil government for the security of temporal comforts to his rational creatures, so neither has he prescribed any particular form of ecclesiastical polity as absolutely necessary to the attainment of eternal happiness. The Scriptures do not prescribe any definite form of Church government.”—*Tomline's Elements*, vol. ii. p. 396. It is true that the New Testament has not prescribed a definite form; but comparing the New Testament with the practice of the Apostolic and succeeding ages, we shall have no difficulty in arriving at the conclusion that the Episcopal mode was that which received the sanction of the Apostles, and which was consequently prescribed by the Saviour, though not stated as a matter necessary to salvation in the writings of the New Testament.

Among the topics discussed in Mr. Short's volumes, the treatment of the Puritans in the reign of Elizabeth is one upon which he appears to us to be mistaken. He is aware that at that time there was no difference of opinion between the Church and the Puritans as to the lawfulness of compulsory conformity. Toleration for separate worship, or even for the disuse of certain ceremonies retained and enjoined by the Church, was not the aim of the Puritans. They demanded the total rejection of the rites

and observances to which they objected, and required that the Church should be modelled according to their platform. On their part the struggle was not for freedom, but for precedence: and had the bishops yielded to their scruples on the points then in dispute, they would have been assailed on all sides by a host of other objectors, who would have alleged other grievances, from which they desired to be released. Mr. Short imagines that their scruples were not treated with tenderness, and that concessions might have been made with safety.—vol. i. 372, 374. Strype assures us that at this early period the Puritans were by no means harshly treated, and that none of them were deprived until after repeated admonitions. Mr. Short supposes that many of the first Puritans would have been satisfied with toleration. Does he mean a toleration for separate worship, or for the disuse of the obnoxious ceremonies? We believe that they would not have been satisfied with either: they soon began to speak of their system as the discipline of Christ: and as such they deemed it their duty to use every effort for its establishment in the Church. With such views they could scarcely have been satisfied with a toleration.

“Such steps, however,” says Mr. Short, “were little suited for the character of Elizabeth, who would as readily have surrendered her crown, as have allowed her subjects to exercise their private judgments on such matters; and the punishment of death was deemed the only remedy for Brownists, who denied the queen's supremacy in any but civil matters.”—vol. i. p. 433, 434.

It is notorious that so far from being contented with a toleration, they would have pronounced it as a heresy pregnant with destruction to the Church. Some severities were undoubtedly exercised on the Brownists: but Mr. Short should have recollected, that by many of the Puritans, had they obtained the ascendancy in ecclesiastical matters, the Brownists would have been subjected to the same treatment. These severities ought to be attributed to their true cause, namely, the false maxims of the age, and not, as Mr. Short insinuates, to the character of Elizabeth. The punishment inflicted on the Brownists was doubtless very severe, and not at all consonant with the principles of the present enlightened times; but in the estimation of the advisers of Elizabeth there was much treason mingled with their practices. They were not punished for their non-conformity, but for refusing to acknowledge the queen's supremacy; and Mr. Short must be aware that it would have been extremely dangerous to have treated with lenity men who refused to make such an acknowledgment. We mean not by these observations to justify the measures of the queen's government; all we do mean is simply this, that in

forming our estimate of the practices of that age, we ought not to lose sight of the circumstances in which the queen was placed. The supremacy was denied by the Roman Catholics, and many suffered death for their denial. To deny it was made treason; and to have put the Romanists to death for an offence of which others professing Protestant principles were equally guilty, would have been an act of great injustice. Situated as the queen was, she could scarcely have ventured to treat them with forbearance, especially as it was well known that forbearance would only have encouraged them to acts of more decided hostility.

We lament that such divisions should have arisen among Protestants; but we must contend that the blame chiefly lies at the door of the Puritans. This assertion may perhaps be controverted even by some Churchmen; yet when it is remembered that the Puritans did not object to any of the principles of the Church of England, but merely to a few unimportant ceremonies,—when, moreover, it is recollected that these very men would have imposed their own system upon the whole Church, the assertion will not appear to be groundless. It would have been wiser to rest satisfied with the settlement effected by the Reformers than to agitate and disturb the peace of the Church on such subjects. The obnoxious ceremonies were not deemed sinful even by the Puritans. In such a case it was plainly the duty of the minority to yield to the views of the majority, and to sacrifice their own private views to the public welfare. On this question Mr. Short has in our opinion conceded too much to our opponents. He charges the queen, Parker, Aylmer, and Whitgift, with severity in enforcing conformity.—(vol. i. p. 477.) We ask, how could they have acted otherwise than they did? So far were the bishops from acting with severity that, according to Fuller, Strype, and others, they acted with unusual forbearance. To have avoided giving offence would have been impossible; but we must protest against the practice of fixing the mark of undue severity on the governors of the Church. We cannot but regret that Mr. Short should, by his observations, have fostered the opinion, so repeatedly advanced by Dissenters, that the Puritans were treated with greater harshness than the circumstances of the times rendered necessary.

It affords us pleasure to find Mr. Short defending Laud from the charges so uncharitably heaped upon him by the malice of his enemies. Laud was a great and a good man; nor were his enemies unacquainted with his excellent qualities, or they would not have sought his life with such eagerness and unchristian zeal. They envied his greatness, while they were jealous of his abilities, and they were bent upon his destruction as a hated and dangerous enemy. From Mr. Orme he meets with no mercy. “The best

of the Clergy," says he, "were under Laud's administration either silenced or obliged to leave the country."—*Life of Owen*, p. 17. *The best of the Clergy!* Non-conformity, according to Mr. Orme, is a virtue. For this alone the puritanic Clergy were better than their conforming brethren. We ask, however, were not the Clergy who complied with the ceremonies as conscientious and exemplary as those who refused to conform? Might not some of these men have been influenced by other motives than those for which such writers as Mr. Orme give them credit? Is not the love of singularity, or the desire of notoriety, as likely to lead men to act in opposition to authority as scruples of conscience?

"If they did not," says Mr. Orme, "bow to the altar, would not read the book of sports, or were guilty of the crime of holding lectures, or of preaching twice on the Lord's day, it was enough to bring them before the High Commission Court, and subject them to all its oppressive and iniquitous censures."—*Life of Baxter*, vol. ii. p. 259.

This is notoriously false. They were not subjected to oppressive censures on the charges mentioned in the preceding extract. It is, indeed, true that the above were some of the charges alleged against those who appeared before the commission; but they were not the whole, nor yet the principal; nor would any individual have been suspended or deprived on these charges alone. In every case of suspension or deprivation the individual refused to subscribe to the articles and formularies, and to conform to the ceremonies, of the Church. These very men had taken the oath of canonical obedience, by which they were bound to submit to the ordinary in all lawful matters; and it was the duty of the bishop to take care that the laws of the Church were not broken with impunity; they had assented to the established order and discipline; and it was for breaches of discipline, and not merely for the matters specified by Mr. Orme, that they were questioned in the Court of Commission.

Though we have animadverted upon some of the views entertained by Mr. Short, we yet consider his work to be exceedingly valuable, and admirably calculated for the individuals for whom it is intended by the author. Of Mr. Orme's works we shall be constrained to speak with unqualified disapprobation, and in terms of extreme severity. In allusion to the efforts of the Puritans our author remarks:—

"It cannot be doubted, that had their object been accomplished, the Church of England would have been much improved, and so far as externals are concerned, it would have been brought nearer the model of Scripture, and thus rendered more worthy of the designation of which

her sons are so proud, 'the glory and bulwark of the Reformation.' But although they had succeeded, so long as the spiritual and temporal kingdoms remained incorporated, the root of the evil must still have continued."—*Life of Owen*, p. 7.

The cloven foot of independency is distinctly seen through the flimsy covering of the above extract. The author deprecates an established Church as an evil; we, on the other hand believe, that the Church has been the means of the preservation of the religion of our land. Were the whole country left to the system of independency, or, in other words to the voluntary system, most of the congregations, being without articles, creeds, and formularies, would soon be merged in Socinianism, or indifference. We believe that whatever is good in Dissent is mainly owing to the existence and preservation of the Establishment; from the Establishment, Dissent takes its tone. Let the Establishment be swept away, and not only would true religion suffer, but the religion even of Dissenters would be deteriorated. It is an extraordinary feature in the controversy now existing between the voluntaries and the Church, that the lawfulness and necessity of an established Church were never questioned until the rise of Brownism and Independency in the seventeenth century. Surely, it is too absurd to imagine that such an important discovery as the unlawfulness of the connexion between the Church and the State should have been reserved for the men of the present generation. If the connexion involve such consequences, as Mr Orme in the volumes before us, and the whole tribe of voluntaries in their tracts and speeches assert, we cannot conceive that God, as the moral governor of the world, would have permitted the evil to remain through so long a series of ages. The advocates of Dissent are not gifted with greater powers; they are not men of greater sagacity; nor are they better interpreters of the sacred text, or more deeply versed in the writings of the early fathers, than those who have, from the earliest ages, contended for the principle that it is the duty of a Christian government to provide, by means of an established Church, for the spiritual wants of the people. It is rather too much to assert, as is virtually done by the Independents, that all the world are in error on the question of Church government, except the advocates of their own system. Nothing short of a special revelation could warrant the use of the strong language adopted by the defenders of the voluntary principle.

It was not till within the last few years that the Dissenters openly avowed their hostility to the Established Church; many, indeed, have frequently professed a great veneration for her institutions, and have expressed themselves perfectly satisfied with the repose secured to them by the Toleration Act; but now war is

openly declared; and they have taken their stand on the question of Church-rates—a question which involves the whole principle of an establishment. Though this subject is not directly agitated in Mr. Orme's volumes, it yet is so intimately connected with the principles for which he contends, that we cannot refrain from a few remarks. The very existence of an Established Church involves the necessity of keeping up the parochial fabrics at the expense of the public. When the plea of injustice is alleged by Dissenters as a ground for refusing the payment of Church-rates, it appears to us that the true state of the question is altogether lost sight of; the property of Dissenters was purchased subject to a particular charge, and they have nothing whatever to do with the mode in which the money collected by the rate is applied by the State. Nor can the plea of conscience be maintained by one single argument of weight. How can conscience be concerned in the matter; the sum paid by the Dissenter is not his own property,—what are his claims upon it? How did he become possessed of it? The State has imposed a certain tax on the property of the country to be devoted to a particular purpose, with which the person who pays it has no concern whatever; he receives his property subject to such a charge, and he is only the medium through which the impost is collected. What becomes then of the plea of conscience? How can their consciences be involved in the payment of a sum upon which they have no claim whatever, any more than in the payment of poor-rates or assessed taxes, both of which are enforced by the law. But we have a graver charge to allege against the body of the Dissenters in their adoption of this plea. Let us take the case of a town in which a petition is prepared for presentation to parliament; the plea of conscience is urged in the petition; and it is finally presented as the petition of men who cannot conscientiously submit to the payment of Church-rates. We have shown the fallacy of the plea on general grounds; but we ask who are the persons whose signatures are attached to the document? It contains the names of many Dissenters; but are the names of Dissenters only to be found in the list? It purports to be a petition against Church-rates; as such, persons are invited to sign it; and it is notorious that in large towns, the places from which such petitions chiefly emanate, the majority of persons whose names are subscribed are not Dissenters; they are alike regardless of the principles of the Church or those of Dissent, yet they are prepared to unite with the Dissenters in their attacks on the institutions of the country. Still it cannot be pleaded that these persons have any conscientious scruples on the subject; and to permit them to affix their signatures to petitions in which such a plea is set up, is an act of

dishonesty, to give it no worse name, on the part of those who are the principal actors in such scenes.

The necessity of an Established Church was insisted on by the Non-conformists, in 1662, as strenuously as by the Episcopalians. By the fathers of non-conformity the voluntary system was deprecated as an evil of no small magnitude. They knew from personal experience that the means supplied by it would be inadequate to the wants of the people. They depended for subsistence on voluntary contributions; yet even under such circumstances, circumstances calculated to elicit the sympathy of those who valued their ministry, their pittance was exceedingly scanty. Should the Established Church be even swept away, an effort would undoubtedly be made by Churchmen in every part of the kingdom to provide for the maintenance of the settled ministry; but could it be hoped that these exertions would be continued? Might we not fear that after a short season of apparent prosperity these efforts would die away. Should the parishes of our land be left to the tender mercies of the voluntary system, what an inlet would be opened for the admission of jesuitical and fanatical emissaries, who would not fail, when the parish Church was closed, to disseminate the poison of their principles among the unlettered portion of our countrymen.

We proceed to notice another sentiment advocated by Mr. Orme, and admitted by Dissenters in general. Alluding to the ministry of the Church and to the mode of entering it, Mr. Orme observes, "Some radical mistake must exist when the Church of Christ becomes, or is capable of being made, the theatre of worldly ambition." That some individuals do enter the ministry from unworthy motives is readily admitted: but is the Church of England alone exposed to such a calamity? Are the clergy for instance, as a body, better paid than dissenting ministers! Few Dissenters receive less than one hundred pounds per annum, yet there are hundreds of clergymen who are remunerated at the rate of eighty, fifty, or even forty pounds, without the slightest prospect of an addition from ecclesiastical sources. There is nothing here very tempting to worldly ambition—nor are dissenting ministers less exposed to temptation in this respect than the clergy. An income of one hundred pounds per annum, and a better station in society, are as likely to tempt a tradesman to enter the ministry among the Dissenters, as are the livings and the curacies of the Church to induce a man to enter the ministry of the Establishment. We believe that secular views are quite as prevalent among dissenting ministers as they are among the clergy of our Church.

There are many other points on which we conceive that our

system will bear a comparison with that of Dissenters, and that the decision will be in our favour. In reference to the question of subscription to articles of faith, Mr. Orme charitably remarks :

“ All such subscriptions are unrighteous impositions, impede the progress of truth, ensnare the minds of the subscribers, and operate as a bounty on hypocrisy. They secure a monopoly of privileges to the chartered corporations, and exclude from the enjoyment of advantages that ought to be common, a large portion of the principle and talent of the country.”—*Life of Owen*, p. 21.

Such is the gentle censure of our practice of subscription by an Apostle of Dissent: yet this very practice is common, nay, universal, with Dissenters; for not only are dissenting ministers compelled to assert their general agreement in matters of importance with the body to which they attach themselves, but also in things of the most trivial nature. We do not quarrel with Dissenters for requiring a confession of faith from their ministers; but we complain, and we think with justice, of their reprobation of subscription as enjoined by the Church of England, while their own practice is in exact accordance with that, which is so vehemently denounced. The latitude granted to the clergy is far greater than that permitted among Dissenters. It not unfrequently happens that a dissenting minister is rejected for opinions on some minor matters, which chance to be at variance with those entertained by the majority of his flock. To the articles and formularies of the Church her ministers are bound to subscribe; in the case of refusal, exclusion from the ministry, or, if subsequent to ordination, from any parochial charge, is the certain consequence: and where lies the hardship of such a proceeding? Dissenters, it is true, have no articles of faith—no formularies—no public documents to which they can appeal as standards of doctrine; but are their ministers at liberty to maintain any sentiments that are likely to be unpalatable to the people? May not dissenting ministers complain of the hardship and injustice of being compelled to adopt opinions in accordance with those of the people? Before a minister is chosen by a congregation, whether it be Independent, Baptist, Socinian, or any of those numerous sects which have from time to time separated from the larger communions, he is under the necessity of rendering an account of his creed to the members of the congregation over whom he wishes to be placed, as the price of his admission to the office of their pastor. Such is the practice, and our mental vision does not enable us to distinguish any difference between this practice and the subscription required of her ministers by the English Church: the latter demands the assent to a written form, the

former require an oral confession; and we contend that the practice of the Church is more liberal than that of the Dissenters; for unless the dissenting candidate shapes his confession so as to suit the views of the people, he is necessarily rejected; or should he, subsequent to his appointment, preach doctrines contrary to those of the congregation, he would be most unceremoniously dismissed. This practice, according to our judgment, is more arbitrary than that which enjoins subscription to a form of sound words, the meaning of which every one can easily comprehend, and whose doctrines are ever the same. When it is alleged that the articles are a snare to the clergy, Dissenters cannot complain if we contend that the temptation is as great to a dissenting minister, who is conscious that in order to the exercise of his ministry with a particular congregation, his sentiments must exactly coincide with those of the people. It is the veriest trifling to assert that Dissenters are not called upon to subscribe to forms and ceremonies, for do they not virtually do the same thing, when they profess to belong to a particular body distinguished by certain peculiarities from all other classes, and when any deviation from the received practice would subject them not to censure but actual expulsion from the ministerial charge?

The discipline of our Church is another favourite subject of remark and censure among Dissenters, and, as far as the charge can be alleged with truth, we are perfectly ready to admit it. "The entire want of discipline," says Mr. Orme, "which has always characterised the established Church, is one of its greatest blots. There is no separation whatever between the precious and the vile."—*Life of Baxter*, vol. i. p. 158. The writer affects to speak of the Church in the language of pity, and to lament the laxity of her discipline. Why, we ask, should a man, who in other places speaks of the very constitution of the Church as unscriptural, manifest such apparent anxiety concerning the laxity of her discipline? Are Dissenters really grieved in consequence of the discipline of the English Church? Alas! such professions are vain! It cannot be supposed that they are anxious to see the Church flourish. There is the greatest inconsistency in the conduct of Dissenters on this subject; they tell us that the Church is unscriptural, and then they affect to lament that her discipline is so defective. Do they wish to see her discipline improved? Would they in parliament support such measures as would seem calculated to produce such a result? We believe not; nay, on this subject we may speak with certainty, for it is notorious that some measures, introduced into parliament in the session of 1836, calculated to advance the interests of the Church, were stopped in their progress by the popish and dissenting

party, who are fearful of her power, and the influence of her ministers with the people; or rather the measures to which we allude, were relinquished at the instigation of the radical and dissenting party. It is however our firm conviction that Dissenters are not in a better state as to this matter. Among themselves there is the same mixture of the precious and the vile. We do not believe that more purity exists among dissenting congregations, than is to be found in those of the Church of England.

Much has been said and written on the origin of the civil war, and according to the opinions of different parties is the guilt of its commencement charged upon Charles or the Long Parliament. Mr. Orme has no hesitation in attributing the whole of the evils by which the country was afflicted to the unfortunate monarch: "The continual breaches made in the constitution by Charles I., from the period of his accession to the throne, till he was forced to leave it; by his arbitrary treatment of his parliament, by his persevering attempts to render himself independent of them; by his illegal mode of raising money; by the oppression and cruelty with which those who asserted their civil or religious liberty were treated; these were the real causes of the war."—*Life of Owen*, p. 23. Let us now hear Mr. Hallam on the same subject, who is a constitutional Whig, but not a Dissenter; as a historian he is so honest as to attribute the war to its true cause, the Long Parliament. "Of the parliament it may be said that scarce two or three public acts of justice, humanity, or generosity, and very few of particular wisdom, are recorded of them from their quarrel with the king to their expulsion by Cromwell."—vol. ii. p. 209. Again the same writer remarks: "After every allowance, he must bring very heated passions to the records of these times who does not perceive in the conduct of the parliament a series of glaring violations, not only of positive and constitutional, but of those higher principles which are paramount to all immediate policy." He elsewhere observes, that war was inevitable when Hotham shut the gates of Hull against his sovereign; yet the members of the Long Parliament are eulogized by Mr. Orme for their constitutional acts. "It is a duty, while recording events and describing characters as they really existed, to embrace every fair opportunity of vindicating the brave, and I must call them enlightened men, who fought the battle of England's liberties, and to whose memories a large debt of gratitude still remains undischarged."—*Life of Baxter*, vol. i. p. 67. That this gentleman's feelings are not dissimilar from those of the preachers of that period, who, from the pulpit and from the press, inflamed the minds of the people at the commencement of the war against the king and the Church, is evident from the above ex-

tract. It is also clear that a very large share of the blame of the war must attach to the ministers; nor is Owen exempt from the same charge, though a defence is set up for him by Mr. Orme, who labours to prove that the following passage is nothing more than "a mere rhetorical application of the words of Scripture—with the design of impressing the importance of remembering past mercies." The passage occurs in one of Owen's sermons.—"Where is the God of Marston Moor? and the God of Naseby is an acceptable expostulation in a gloomy day. Oh what a catalogue of mercies hath this nation to plead in a time of trouble! God came from Naseby and the Holy One from the west."—See *Life of Owen*, p. 87. It is evident from the preceding extract that Mr. Orme, like his hero Owen, views the victory at Naseby as a special mercy sent from heaven. Mr. Orme does not even attempt to defend Owen from the heavy charge of stirring up the war; he evidently approves of the proceedings of the parliament. "Though," says he, "they were guilty of occasional evils, and produced temporary confusion, the great objects which they contemplated were never lost sight of, and the result of the struggle was in a high degree glorious."—*Life of Baxter*, vol. i. p. 47. Is this, we ask, the language in which a Christian, whatever might be his political opinions, would desire to speak on such a subject as the civil wars? The man, who in the nineteenth century could pen such a passage, would have been found, had he lived at the period in question, among the foremost of those who from the pulpit were so active in promoting the contest against their sovereign. Mr. Hallam's views on this subject are much more just than those which are maintained by this Christian minister:—"When we read the violent and barbarous proceedings of the parliament, is it consistent with honesty or humanity to hold up that assembly to admiration while the faults on the king's side are studiously aggravated?"—*Hallam*, vol. ii. p. 244. For a minister of religion to speak of the results of the contest as glorious, is surely very much in opposition to the principles of the Gospel. Mr. Orme is gone to his account; but his works remain and are extensively read by Dissenters, and it is necessary to guard the public against their erroneous and partial statements.

It has been the practice since the days of Calamy, the first chronicler of their trials, to speak in strong terms of the sufferings of the ejected ministers, and to institute a comparison between their trials and those of the episcopal clergy sequestered between 1640 and 1660. The Dissenters are accustomed to contend that the severities of 1662 were infinitely greater than those of the previous period, but we are of opinion that the contrary position

has been completely established. No one was ejected in 1662 on suspicion, whereas during the war numbers were sequestered in consequence of their supposed loyalty to the king and attachment to the episcopal Church. In 1662 conformity at all events secured to a man the possession of his living, but during the period of England's troubles even an acquiescence in the existing mode of worship was no security to the clergy, if their names were denounced to the parliament, or their persons were obnoxious to any of their discontented parishioners. After all the attempts to inflict a stigma on the character of the sequestered clergy, the only charge that could be substantiated against them was that of "malignancy," or opposition to the parliament. Though their enemies, both at that time and since, have laboured hard to fasten upon them the charge of immorality, yet to any one who takes the trouble to examine the proceedings of the period, it will be evident that *malignancy* was their only crime. From the pages of the notorious White himself we will undertake to establish the above position, and to repel the charge of immorality against the great body of the clergy. White published what he called "*A First Centurie of Scandalous Ministers.*" He doubtless selected the cases which, in his own estimation, were best calculated to support his charges; yet from the instances which he himself adduces, it is clear that the clergy in general were not guilty of any breaches of the rules of morality. Their sole crime, and in the estimation of the parliament it was a crime of no small magnitude, was a refusal to support the war against the king. The very title of the pamphlet was intended to imply that all the ejected clergy were scandalous in their conduct. It was a part of the policy of the parliament to jumble together a great number of charges besides that of malignancy, which was usually so mingled with the rest that the people were led to believe that it was only mentioned incidentally, and that the other charges were amply sufficient to justify a sequestration. Malignancy however is the real crime against those whose names are recorded in White's Centurie. A perusal of the pamphlet will, by its own internal evidence, convince the unprejudiced reader that the charge of immorality, the only crime that could justify the designation "scandalous ministers" in the pamphlet and in the parliamentary ordinances, was in most cases a mere pretence for the purpose of concealing from the public eye the fact that the individuals accused were sequestered for opposition to the parliament, and for that alone. We will now proceed to an examination of White's pamphlet, for the purpose of justifying the preceding remarks.

The title, as already stated, was "*A First Centurie of scan-*

dalous, malignant Priests, made and admitted into Benefices by the Prelates: or a Narration of the Causes for which the Parliament hath ordered the Sequestration of the Benefices of several Ministers complained of before them, for Vitiousness of Life, Errors in Doctrine, contrary to the Articles of our Religion, and for Practising and Pressing Innovations against Law, and for *Malignancy against the Parliament.*" Such is the title. The sting lies in the tail of it. The real and the only true charge is mentioned last. In the beginning they are in general designated "scandalous, malignant priests;" but at the close the charge of "malignancy against the parliament" is specified, in order to induce the belief that immorality constituted the chief crime for which they were sequestered. Our readers will perceive that the charges are very indefinite, yet very comprehensive; and if one failed, another could easily be established, for it was always easy to prove malignancy, which signified nothing more than a refusal to assist the parliament, or neutrality. The epistle to the reader contains what may be deemed a kind of bill of fare of what may be expected from the body of the work. "In this book, thou shalt have an assay of the gall and worme-wood of the Episcopal government, taken out of London, the metropolis, and of the counties adjacent, that when thou seest what vermine crawls upon, and devours the principall and vitall parts, thou maist reflect with a mournful heart upon the more miserable condition of Wales, and of the North, the more remote parts of this Kingdome, where upon scrutiny will be easily found many for one as vile and abominable as these." Then follows the conclusion from the foregoing premises:—

"Thou maist by perusal of this booke clearly see what manner of persons those clergie men be that favour the present course of his majestie against his parliament and people, and dislike and maligne the wayes of the parliament, they will appear unto thee to be such as cannot endure the purity: power and strictnesse of the true religion, that late reformation, and to be brought in their hearts, religion and lives to the holy word of God; that seek themselves and not the things of Jesus Christ; that are given over to vile affections, to persecutions, superstitions, ambition, covetousnesse, malignity, and all wickedness."

In the former extract the writer has insinuated that the state of the clergy in Wales and in the northern parts of the kingdom was far worse than in London and its neighbourhood, from which the cases recorded in the Centurie were selected; and Mr. Orme evidently acts upon the insinuations of White as though they were undoubted verities. How, it might be asked, did White become so intimately acquainted with the remote parts of the

kingdom? The inference is, that the insinuation is groundless. It was thrown out merely for the purpose of blackening the character of the clergy. Still it may be proved from White's own pamphlet, that the only charge admitting of proof in the case of the sequestered clergy was one of which they had no reason to be ashamed, that of malignancy. It would be folly to deny that in so large a body as the clergy of that day there were no cases of immorality, but they were fewer in proportion to their numbers than among any other class of the community. Nor indeed were all the immoral characters removed from their livings; for if a clergyman supported the parliament, and instigated his parishioners to contribute towards the support of the war, he was perfectly secure from the interference of the committees, even though his character were grossly immoral. To support the parliament in their attack upon the sovereign, was a virtue that covered a multitude of sins in the clergy.

There are in the *Centurie*, as the term implies, one hundred cases of sequestered clergymen: and in every instance the charge of malignancy is alleged, in some cases alone, in others coupled with charges affecting morals; but there is no single instance of the sequestration of a clergyman for immorality alone—a circumstance fully corroborative of our assertion that immorality did not, when unaccompanied with malignancy, expose a man to ejection from his living. White observes in the epistle to the reader, that he had published these cases to justify the proceedings of the parliament.—“And that the parliament may appear just in their doings and the mouth of iniquity may be stopped, this narrative of the crimes and misdemeanours of those sons of the earth are here published, that all the world may see, that the tongues of these that speake evil of the parliament are set on fire of hell, and lift up against heaven, and that they hide themselves under falsehood, and make lies their refuge.” In our opinion, this language indicates a conviction on the part of White himself that the proceedings of the parliament were marked with injustice. Had the charges alleged admitted of proof, these terms of reproach were not necessary. It is notorious that many of the clergy were eminent for learning as well as for their piety and pastoral labours. This was a fact that could not be disputed, and therefore White, who could not deny it, labours to use it to their disparagement: “And let not the learning of some few of these men (for which, if they had any grace to use it well, they were considerable) move thee to thinke they be hardly dealt with, for learning in a man unsanctified is but a pearle in a swine's snout. Arrius, Pelagius, Arminius, all of them learned, but thereby the more serviceable to do mischief in the Church, like Curio, who was *facundus* only

ad reipublicæ perniciem. Learning and knowledge we honour in
 205, but viciousnesse and lewdnesse we condemn in all ; had some
 of these men sanctity of life as well as light of knowledge, they
 had been honourable to religion and useful to souls." Thus does
 this libeller of the clergy endeavour to traduce the men, whom he
 fails to convict of the charge of immorality.

The first name in the Centurie is that of John Wilson, vicar
 of Arlington, Sussex, who is charged with a nameless offence,
 and with asserting that "*the parliament were rebels.*" The
 second is that of John Agmes, curate of Lewis, in Kent, who is
 charged with drunkenness and "*opposition to the parliament.*"
 Charles Forbench, parson of Newly in Essex, was sequestered
 for swearing, carelessness in his pastoral functions, "*neglecting
 the monthly fasts, setting his men to plow, himself also working
 on those days ;*" and for affirming "*that the Earl of Strafford was
 no traitor, and that he was put to death wrongfully by the parlia-
 ment.*" Stephen Withers, parson of Kelvedon, Essex, was se-
 questered for enticing certain women to commit adultery, practis-
 ing altar worship, administering the sacrament at the rails, not
 permitting his people to have above one sermon on the Lord's
 day, and for "*great malignity to the parliament.*" Emanuel
 Uty, rector of Chigwell, Essex, for speaking favourably of the
 Pope, exalting the power of the bishops, and for "*declaiming
 against the authority of the parliament.*" Edward Cherry, rector
 of Much-Holland, Essex, for bowing towards the east, upholding
 the same practice in his sermons, refusing the sacrament except
 at the rails, drunkenness, and for affirming "*that he never knew
 any good the parliament did, unless it were to rob the country
 and pick their purses.*" These are the first six names in the
 Centurie, and such are the charges alleged. We have given the
 substance of the charges, and sometimes the very words, which
 are printed in Italics. We have taken the first six as a fair sam-
 ple of the whole Centurie : and we will now proceed to select a
 few other instances from different parts of White's production,
 for the purpose, not of specifying all the allegations which were of
 precisely the same kind, but of pointing out the difficulties under
 which the parliament laboured in framing and proving their
 charges against the clergy. Many of the charges were truly lu-
 dicrous, and would never have been brought forward, except in
 the total absence of others of a grave and serious kind.

John Gorsuch was charged with asserting " that some of the
 lords whom he named, were fools, bastards, and cuckholds."
 Nicholas Andrews, with saying, " that Peter's sword cut off but
 one ear, but long sermons, like long swords, cut off both at once,
 and that the silliest creatures have the longest ears." Cuthbert

Dale was removed from his benefice for maintaining "that the angels did mediate for the children of God; and that men might drinke one pot for necessity, a second for recreation, and a third for good fellowship;" and that seeing a stranger put on his hat in sermon time, he openly called him "saucy, unmannerly clowne." The chief charge against Daniel Horsemanden was that he had affirmed "that the late Deputy of Ireland was put to death wrongfully, and was sacrificed, as our Saviour Christ was, to give the people content." Joseph Davis was sequestered for asserting that "the parliament were rogues, and that those who died in their service at Edge-hill went to the devil." William Osbalston for supplying his Church "with scandalous and insufficient curates," and for asserting that "once hearing the Common Prayer is better than ten sermons." Richard Dulon for superstitious practices generally, and for a statement in his catechising "that children dying after baptism are saved by the faith of the godfathers and godmothers." Thomas Vaughan was charged with saying, "that to preach in season is to preach on Sundays in the forenoon, and out of season in the afternoon;" and "that to preach nothing but Scripture without authority of the Fathers, was like the devil's shearing of hogs, a great cry, but a little wool;" and "further, that he also said at the dissolution of the late parliament, that the members were a company of logger-headed fellows." The last case in the Centurie is one of the most singular of the whole. The charge alleged is that of improper language in the pulpit to stir up his auditory to laughter; and the following may be taken as a specimen. "A woman is worse than a sow in two respects; first, because a sow's skin is good to make a cart-saddle, and her bristles good for a sowter. Secondly, because a sow will run away if a man cry *hoy*, but a woman will not turn head, though beaten down with a leaver; and all the difference between a woman and a sow, is in the nape of the neck, where a woman can bend upwards but the sow cannot."

Such were some of the charges gravely exhibited against the clergy as a ground of sequestration by common informers and discontented parishioners, and listened to by the parliamentary committees, who eagerly sought the expulsion of those parochial ministers, whose views led them to look with favour upon the royal cause. These cases are selected at random from the Centurie, for the purpose of exposing the frivolousness of many of the charges brought against the clergy. The cause that needed such support must have been an unjust one. To the above were frequently added the charges of deserting the cure and non-residence; and in these the malice and dishonesty of the parliament may be detected, for in almost all the instances alleged of non-residence

or desertion, the accused were driven from their parishes by the parliamentary soldiers. In their absence a case was got up, presented to the committees, and their livings sequestered. The charge of drunkenness and incontinency is frequently adduced in the *Centurie*: but in almost every instance its falsehood was made apparent at a later period by Walker, who diligently set himself to rescue the memory of the sequestered clergy from unfounded aspersions. In short, the only real crime of which the clergy, whose names are blazoned forth by White, were guilty, is that of malignancy: yet Mr. Orme, who cannot be ignorant of the lying character of the *Centurie*, can assert that in White's publication "a most dreadful exposure is made of the ignorance, immorality, and incompetency of many of the established teachers."—*Life of Baxter*, vol. i. p. 32. Mr. Short remarks, "The accusations which were made against the clergy were, besides offences of a moral nature, generally the observance of ceremonies and malignancy: and it is wonderful that in such a scrutiny no more instances of vicious lives and conversations are recorded."—*Short*, vol. ii. p. 265.

In all the parliamentary ordinances, as well as in White's and other publications, the clergy are designated scandalous and insufficient ministers. Whenever, therefore, a clergyman was called before a committee, he fell under the imputation of being a scandalous minister. This method was resorted to by the parliament for the purpose of reflecting odium on the clergy and exposing them to the insults of the populace. Their accusers were always the most enthusiastic of the sectaries, with whom in that period of excitement almost every parish abounded; or some of the profligate characters, upon whose career of vice the clergy had been a check. When such witnesses were not only listened to, but actually invited to give evidence against the clergy, what was to be expected but sequestration and consequent poverty? At the Restoration, one principle was laid down; and the ministers of that period were duly apprised of the consequences of a refusal to comply with the requirements of the act. No unfair methods were resorted to for the purpose of defaming the characters of the men who refused to conform. Had a similar course been pursued by the Long Parliament;—had they adopted a test, or framed an act, however severe or unjust, whose enactments could be understood by the clergy, and by the application of which even more would have been excluded from their livings than were actually sequestered by the committees,—their proceedings would have been merciful in comparison of those harassing, long-continued, and vindictive measures, by which their steps were marked from the first commencement in the work of legislation to the period when they ceased to

exist as a legislative assembly. Not only were all sorts of abusive epithets accumulated against the clergy, but they were subjected to the petty though still vexatious insults of every man, who owed his clergyman a grudge, or who chose to gratify his vanity by exercising his power over those, whom he had formerly viewed with envy.

The death of the king has been the source of much disputation; nor is it probable that different parties will ever agree on this litigated question. Mr. Orme, with his usual ingenuity, labours hard to shift it from the Independents. "The real causes," says he, "are not to be found in the principles or members of any religious body; but are to be traced most probably to the duplicity and fickleness of Charles himself—to the unconstitutional and despotic principles perpetually instilled into his mind by his immediate attendants and confidential friends, and to the perilous circumstances of the democratic leaders, who had gone too far to recede, and were driven to this desperate stroke for their own salvation."—*Owen's Life*, 92, 93. The last clause in the preceding quotation certainly nullifies the two former, for when it is admitted that the circumstances of the leaders of the democratic party were such as to hurry them on to the most desperate measures, it is trifling to assert that Charles was the cause of his own death. The Independents were undoubtedly the immediate cause of that melancholy event; their principles were destructive of monarchy and kings; nor did they conceal their intentions or disguise their principles, though the attempt to do so has often been made for them since: but the Presbyterians also must stand condemned in the judgment of impartial posterity; they refused all concessions from the king until it was too late, and, rather than not secure their beloved presbytery, they were determined to run all hazards and risk the loss even of monarchy itself. We are aware that they did not contemplate such consequences as flowed from their obstinacy; but they ought to have seen that the course upon which the army, backed by the Independents and sectaries, had entered, was one that must inevitably issue in the destruction of the sovereign.

After the death of Charles, Independency became triumphant, to the great annoyance of the presbyterian clergy, who were eager to seize for their own Church that power which had been wrested from the bishops. The very notion of an Established Church was exploded by the Independents and Sectaries, who now abounded in every part of the country; and though the majority of the parochial churches were held by ministers of the presbyterian creed, yet there was not even the semblance of a national church. It was Cromwell's policy to encourage the growth of

Sectaries in the army and in the country, while his own views were carefully concealed. While, therefore, the present occupiers of the livings were permitted to remain undisturbed in their possessions, provided they did not oppose the new order of things, it became a primary object with him to strengthen the Independents and Sectaries, without entirely discarding the Presbyterians, by remodelling the committees for sequestration, and by infusing into those bodies principles more in accordance with his own and more calculated to promote his views. Accordingly, he joined Presbyterians and Independents together in these committees; and, instead of entrusting the examination and appointment of ministers to the Assembly of Divines, or to those nominated by their authority, as was the case during the reign of Presbytery, he constituted an entirely new body, composed adroitly of men of all parties, denominated the "*Triers*," to whom was committed the examination of the new ministers. In Wales almost all the clergy were ejected, while a few itinerants were appointed, who travelled from place to place, preaching in different quarters. Hence it happened that most of the churches were closed, and the people were not able to hear a sermon except at very distant intervals.

Mr. Orme labours to prove that there was nothing remarkable in the sects that sprang up during this period, and that they were not so numerous as is generally imagined. "Baxter's own account," he remarks, "which discovers no disposition to conceal or extenuate, shows that, beside the leading religious parties which were composed mostly of respectable persons, there were only five other sects that he could describe."—*Baxter*, vol. i. p. 120. Probably there were not five that Baxter could describe; but Mr. Orme omits to tell us how many there were, which neither Baxter nor any other man could describe. That the sects were most numerous is evident from contemporary publications, and that it was not possible for any one to describe them is also evident. But Mr. Orme is inconsistent with himself, for speaking in his former work of the same period, and on the same subject, he observes, "During the period of England's convulsions, many extravagances and abuses prevailed. New sects were every day springing up, each more fanatical or erroneous than the former; and though they had, in general, but an ephemeral existence, they produced, while they lasted, injurious effects on true religion, and left very baneful consequences behind them."—*Life of Owen*, p. 385. The works of contemporary authors, such as Edwards, Rutherford, Baillie, Gillespie, and others, as well as many of the sermons preached by the parliamentary divines before the two Houses, or before the Westminster Assembly, afford

the most striking and convincing evidence, that the number of sectaries at this period was almost beyond calculation, and that their peculiar principles were such that they could not be described. To mention even the names which are actually enumerated in the works to which we have alluded, would occupy a far larger space than we can devote to such a purpose. At a period when every man was at liberty to become a preacher, and when almost every soldier actually was a preacher, it would have been surprising indeed, if the sects had not been exceedingly numerous. It would be a task of very great difficulty to characterize all the sects of the present day: at that time the difficulty was infinitely greater.

By far the most remarkable individual of those tumultuous times was Oliver Cromwell, whose character is largely discussed in these volumes. It appears to us that Cromwell was less of an enthusiast than his chaplains. What is stated to have fallen from the lips of Sterry and Goodwin borders strongly on blasphemy. Mr. Orme therefore endeavours to show that the expressions alleged to have been used during Cromwell's illness, and at the time of his death, were never uttered, or that they were misinterpreted by some who heard them. Thus Mr. Orme labours to explain away the expressions in Goodwin's prayer, who, addressing the Deity, said, "thou hast deceived us, and we were deceived." Mr. Orme remarks, that these were the words of the prophet Jeremiah, and that they were used in the same sense "in which the prophet employs them, not as denoting what God had done, but what he had permitted men to do." Mr. Orme did not choose to remember, when he penned this passage, that the sermons and the publications of the day afford specimens of enthusiasm as great as the above. In the dedication of a book to Richard Cromwell, during his protectorate, Oliver is designated "his sainted father, now with God." And if the following extracts from Owen do not savour of enthusiasm, they certainly indicate the grossest hypocrisy. "I present them to your Excellency, not only because the rise of my call to this service under God was from you, but also because, in carrying it on, I have received from you in weaknesses and temptations wherewith I am encompassed, that daily spiritual refreshment and support by inquiry into and discovery of the deep and hidden dispensations of God towards his secret ones, which my spirit is taught to value. The carrying on of the interest of the Lord Jesus amongst his saints, in all his ways, which are truth and righteousness, being the aim of your spirit in your great undertakings."—See *Owen's Dedication of the Branch of the Lord*. At a later period, in another dedication to Oliver, prefixed to his "Perseverance of

the Saints," he thus addresses him : " Sir, of both temporal and spiritual good things you have had the full experience—your interest and acquaintance with the latter is of incomparably more importance in itself, so answerably of more value and esteem unto you."

No one subject connected with the history of those times was more fiercely agitated than that of liberty of conscience. Since the establishment of universal toleration, it has been the fashion with many writers to hold up the Church of England as the enemy of religious liberty ; though an impartial examination of facts will show, that in an age when all were intolerant, she acted with more leniency than any of those parties who were opposed to her. Mr. Orme contends, that the principles of toleration were first advocated by the Independents ; yet the Independents of the Commonwealth refused to tolerate the Episcopalians, who, at a period when every sect revelled in liberty bordering on licentiousness, were proscribed even the use of the common-prayer in private. How can it be said that the Independents were the advocates of toleration ! When it is alleged that the Independents actually persecuted those who differed from them, Mr. Orme, unable to deny the fact, observes, " That men, calling themselves Independents, may be persecutors, it would be foolish to deny ; but that such conduct is inconsistent with the principles and the spirit of Independency, all who understand it must ever maintain."—*Owen's Life*, 335. This is a most convenient method of getting out of a difficulty, and one which may be resorted to alike by all parties. It is easy to say, the acts you allege cannot be imputed to the body, but to certain individuals, whose opinions are at variance with those of the majority. That the Independents, however, did actually persecute others, is clear from their conduct in New England. In England itself prelacy was excepted from toleration equally with popery, during the ascendancy of this party in the state, though a full toleration was conceded to the wildest sectaries. That they were as much inclined to persecute as others, if circumstances had favoured the establishment of their system, is a point that can admit of no question. Owen is adduced by Mr. Orme as one of the first, if not *the first*, advocate of toleration. It is true that Owen, during the latter part of his life, when suffering under restrictions, pleaded for liberty of conscience ; but his sentiments were not always equally moderate. There was a time when he was as much opposed to toleration as the most bigoted Presbyterian. He asserts in one place, " that heresies and errors ought not to be tolerated ; that is, men ought not to connive at them—but with all their strength and abilities, in all lawful ways, upon every just call, to oppose,

suppress, and overthrow them, to root them up and cast them out.”—See *Owen’s Practice of Church Government*. Some years subsequent to the date of the above publication, when Cromwell was about to establish himself in the Protectorate, by means of the toleration of the sectaries, Owen expressed himself with more moderation. In a tract annexed to his sermon on the death of the king, he asserts, “that error has as much right to a forcible defence as truth.”

Because the Church of England was fenced about, subsequent to the Restoration, by the Act of Uniformity, it does not follow that she was more averse to toleration than her opponents. The ascendancy of the Presbyterians and Independents did not in the least soften them towards prelacy : it rather increased their bitterness : but the Church of England, at the period of the Revolution, willingly conceded the fullest toleration to those who refused to conform. She has been designated the most tolerant church in the world, and her history fully justifies the designation.

We cannot pass over some observations of Mr. Short, relative to the Act of Uniformity. In allusion to the ejected ministers, Mr. Short asks, “Could it be just to cast them out of all means of supporting themselves, and not assign them any portion of their benefices for their support? The usurping government, when triumphant, had allowed one-fifth of the revenues to those whom it ejected for their loyalty. The legitimate government turned out many loyal, though non-conforming clergymen, and made not the slightest provision for them.”—vol. ii. p. 267. Mr. Short must have known that the assignment of the *fifths* to the sequestered clergy, was a mere pretence—a mere mockery of their miseries—an act of greater cruelty than a positive denial of the smallest pittance : for it is well known that the *fifths* were never paid, and that the usurping government, though armed with authority, never enforced their payment. There was no redress for the clergy : for whenever they appealed to the courts of justice, the intrusive ministers succeeded by various pretexts in silencing the pleas of the sufferers. These are facts that do not admit of the slightest doubt : and we are extremely sorry that Mr. Short should have lent the influence of his name to such a delusion, as the supposition that the *fifths* were actually paid. The advocates of Dissent will not fail to quote Mr. Short, to prove that the English Church was, at this period, more intolerant than those who were opposed to her discipline and worship.

Much odium has been cast upon the Act of Uniformity by every dissenting writer, from the period of its enactment down to the present time ; yet, under the peculiar circumstances of the times, we cannot conceive that the government could have acted

otherwise. It was a re-action in the country that brought about the restoration of the monarchy and the re-establishment of the Church: nor is it to be supposed, that this re-action would not produce a considerable feeling of opposition against the party that had been instrumental in overturning the national establishment. In the estimation of that House of Commons by whom the act was passed, there was a necessity for strong and decided measures for the purpose of preventing the recurrence of those sad scenes which had so recently been witnessed. After all that has been said in condemnation of the act, and we justify it not, except on the ground of necessity arising from the peculiar circumstances of the period, it was merciful in comparison of the proceedings of the Presbyterians and others during the precedent twenty years. We regret the manner in which Mr. Short has spoken of this act. "The manner," he says, "in which the ejections took place in 1662, must be designated as cruel."—vol. ii. p. 268. He thinks that a more moderate line of policy would have been desirable. We must not, however, judge of the act and its framers by the principles of our own age. A measure, that in the present day would be deemed cruel, may not have deserved such an appellation then; and it is evident that such a plan as that recommended by Mr. Short would have been at that time quite impracticable. That Dissenters should denounce the act, is perfectly natural: but we think that Mr. Orme's censure is extravagant, even for a Dissenter. "The hardest, the most unjust, the most oppressive measure that could be adopted was the rigorous enforcement of Episcopacy and the Liturgy, with all their concomitants, on pious and conscientious men. For this, whoever was the party chiefly concerned in it, no apology can be found. It was an unnecessary and a cruel act of despotism."—*Life of Baxter*, vol. i. p. 221. We do not concur in opinion with those churchmen, who think that the Act of Uniformity was incapable of defence; or that it was an act over which it is desirable to draw a veil. Our opinion is, that the more fully the measure is canvassed, if the peculiar circumstances of the times are permitted to have due weight with those who wish to form a conclusion respecting it, the greater will appear the necessity for its enactment. At all events, the members of the English Church can look back upon the proceedings of that period with much greater satisfaction than can be experienced by Dissenters in reviewing the history of the preceding years, during which Episcopacy was suppressed, and the clergy treated with scorn and indignity.

We have ever thought that there was an inconsistency on the part of those ministers who suffered ejection in 1662, in relin-

quishing their posts in preference to conformity. These men had represented toleration as the worst of evils: and they had resolutely refused to grant liberty to others during their own ascendancy: after, therefore, such denunciations against liberty of conscience, it would have been more consistent in them to have complied with the requisitions of the act, which, however it might interfere with their own views, was not, according to their own reasonings, so great an evil as schism. The act is now usually stigmatized by Dissenters as the Black Act: but that its hue was as dark as that of some of the parliamentary ordinances, and the votes of the Westminster Assembly, cannot be proved. We have no wish to justify the proceedings of those times; but when Dissenters are so clamorous in their outcries against the Church of England, as if she alone at that period had adopted principles repudiated by all other parties, it becomes necessary to divest the matter of those obscurities which the lapse of time and the prejudices of party have thrown around it. It is the custom with some writers to speak of the Church of England as guilty of ejecting her own ministers in consequence of their refusal to submit to her unrighteous impositions. We regret that Mr. Wilberforce, in alluding to the ejected ministers, should have so expressed himself, as to give at least the appearance of support to such a mistaken view. "I must beg," says he, speaking of Baxter, "to class among the highest ornaments of the Church of England this great man, who, with his brethren, was so shamefully ejected from the Church in 1662, in violation of the royal word, as well as of the clear principles of justice." Now we remark, in the first place, that the ejected ministers could scarcely be deemed members of the Church of England, when they refused to submit to her discipline, or to adopt her formularies; the utmost that can be said of them is, that they occupied the livings which belonged of right to the Church: nor can we, in the second place, allow that Baxter and his brethren were the highest ornaments of the Church; on the contrary, we believe that the conforming clergy were equal in piety and superior in learning to those who were ejected. The question at that time agitated was, whether the Church or the Non-conformists should yield. Mr. Orme proceeds a step further, and tells us, "that the Church of England was unworthy of the men whom she cast out."—*Owen's Life*, p. 292. He also speaks of these men as "two thousand of the most excellent ministers of the Church of England," who, as he again observes, were cast out "because they could not submit to the exercise of an unrighteous authority."—*Baxter*, vol. i. p. 286—303. From Mr. Orme such assertions were to be expected; but we are sorry that Mr. Wilberforce should have adopted a similar tone in his remarks: we are

however sure that, had he considered the subject more fully, he would not have ventured to lend the support of his authority to such an erroneous opinion.

The question relative to the sufferings and the numbers of the sufferers of the two parties, is one that has been fiercely agitated. As soon as the advocates of Non-conformity began to register the sufferings of the ministers ejected, under the operation of the Act of Uniformity, they asserted that the case was without a parallel in the history of the Church, either in ancient or modern times. In consequence of this conduct on their part, the friends of the Church were compelled to come forward with a statement of the sufferings of the sequestered clergy, under the ascendancy of Presbyterianism. Walker's work is well known, and it was called forth by the boast of Calamy, that such a noble army of sufferers for conscience sake had never been seen, as that of the ejected ministers. The number of those who were removed, under the operation of the act of 1662, is usually stated in round numbers at two thousand; but it is remarkable, that while the Dissenters labour to increase the number of the ejected ministers, they are equally anxious to diminish that of the sequestered clergy. The statements of Dissenters on this question have been repeated over and over again, in volumes, pamphlets, and even catechisms, so that they are received without doubt or hesitation. Even Mr. Short is doubtful whether the number of the sequestered episcopal clergy has not been exaggerated by Gauden and Walker. "The want of any abstract of the proceedings of these committees, has rendered the task of estimating the numbers of those who were ejected exceedingly difficult; but the attempt has been made by Gauden, who states it as his opinion, that between six and seven thousand clergymen were ejected. Walker's calculation goes higher, but these computations are probably much beyond the truth."—*Short*, vol. ii. p. 167. We know not why, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, the computations alluded to should be doubted by Mr. Short. Both Gauden and Walker furnish us with certain *data* for ascertaining pretty exactly what the numbers were; and when it is remembered that the long space of twenty years was occupied in the work of sequestration, we cannot but admit that the number must have been great.

It is curious to find Mr. Orme claiming a relationship between the Dissenters of the present day and the Non-conformists: "The Puritans under the Tudors became Non-conformists under the Stuarts, and Dissenters under the family of Hanover. They have been men of the same principles substantially throughout."—*Barter's Life*, vol. ii. p. 255. In what the affinity consists, we cannot conceive. As far as matters of discipline are concerned, there is not one single point in which the Dissenters agree with

the Nonconformists—nay, Mr. Orme himself confesses as much a few pages farther on. “The vast majority of these persons did not decidedly object to a modified Episcopacy—to a liturgical form of worship, and to the use of various rites, provided they were not absolutely imposed on their consciences as matters of faith and scriptural practice. They were mostly believers in the lawfulness of a civil establishment of Christianity, and consequently were not Dissenters from the Church; they only objected to certain things belonging to or imposed by it.”—*Baxter*, vol. ii. p. 260. This quotation contradicts the former. According to Mr. Orme’s own showing, the Non-conformists differed less from the Established Church than from the Dissenters of modern times. How then can the Dissenters and the Non-conformists be viewed as “substantially men of the same principles?” Is there one point enumerated in the above quotation on which Dissenters would agree with the Non-conformists! In truth, the controversy is completely changed, and Dissenters now object to the very principle of an Established Church, proving thereby that their claim to a relationship with the ejected ministers is null and void. Every argument, therefore, adduced by Dissenters against an Established Church, is an argument against the Non-conformists, with whom they claim an affinity. By their practices the Dissenters not only stand convicted of a departure from the principles of the Non-conformists, but also from those of all Protestant churches throughout the world, by all of whom the lawfulness and even necessity of an Established Church are strenuously maintained. They form a class of themselves, having few things in common with the great majority of Protestants.

Various attempts were set on foot towards a comprehension of the Non-conformists within the pale of the Church, during the reigns of Charles and James, and at the revolution. The Dissenters do not desire a comprehension: their wish is to place the Church on the same level with themselves. This fact furnishes us with another evidence of the disagreement between the two parties.

It has pleased Mr. Orme, in the fulness of his self-sufficiency, to attack the memories of two of the greatest ornaments of our Church, and we shall employ the remaining pages of this article, already extended to too great a length, in rescuing their characters from unfounded calumny and misrepresentation. The individuals to whom we refer are the judicious Hooker and the learned Stillingfleet; both are attacked in the most unmeasured terms: their motives are impugned, and the most sinister views are imputed to them. To begin with his attack on Hooker:—“Had Hooker’s Polity been written in defence of the Popish

hierarchy, it would have required little alteration." The writer, however, does not attempt to refute Hooker's views; he is content with the above assertion, knowing that it would be received as truth by the great mass of those for whom his work was intended. We need not, however, occupy any further space in defence of Hooker, as Mr. Orme has not brought forward any specific charge.

We proceed to notice his attack on Stillingfleet. Shortly before the Restoration, Stillingfleet published his "*Irenicum*, or a Weapon Salve for the Church's Wounds," in which he recommends moderation to all parties. At this time no settlement had been effected in the Church, and it was the object of Stillingfleet to show that the matters in dispute between the two parties were indifferent, and that each might yield in some points without any sacrifice of principle. In the year 1680, Stillingfleet published a sermon on the "*Mischiefs of Separation*," in which he charges the Non-conformists with departing from the Church on account of trifles, and then points out the evils likely to result from such divisions among Protestants. This sermon was violently attacked by the Non-conformists, who charged the author with a departure from the principles of his earlier years, as expressed in his "*Irenicum*." Soon after the attacks upon the Sermon, the subject was again taken up by the author in a larger work, entitled "*The Unreasonableness of Separation*." In this work Stillingfleet enters very fully into the whole argument: the book was widely circulated, and made a considerable impression on the public mind. The first edition was published in 1681, and during the next year a third made its appearance.

Ever since the publication of "*The Unreasonableness of Separation*," the memory of Stillingfleet has been assailed with abuse. He is charged with inconsistency by contradicting in this last work the sentiments contained in the *Irenicum*. Mr. Orme, as usual, attacks him with the same weapons. Fortunately, however, the reputation of Stillingfleet rests on too solid a foundation to be shaken by such assailants: he was remarkable for the moderation of his views at a period when moderation was a rare virtue, as well as distinguished for amenity of manner towards his opponents: yet the heaviest charges are alleged against him, as if he had been false, proud, and ambitious. It appears to have been the wish of Stillingfleet's traducers to blacken his character as much as possible by groundless charges, instead of attempting to refute his arguments, which were unanswerable. In allusion to the Sermon on the "*Mischief of Separation*," Mr. Orme remarks, "He was no longer Rector of Sutton, but the Dean of St. Paul's, and had now laid aside his '*Weapon Salve for the Church's Wounds*' to

employ another weapon to irritate and increase them.”—*Baxter*, vol. ii. 271. Again, speaking of the “Unreasonableness of Separation:” “The Rector of Sutton, who wrote the ‘*Irenicum*’ when the Church was but a sect among other sects, was a very different person from the Dean of St. Paul’s, exposing the Unreasonableness of Separation from an Apostolic Church in all its glory. The one publication breathes a spirit of moderation, and uses the language of intreaty: the other is stern, severe, and uncompromising.”—*Ibid.* 275. These passages were written in 1830, when the Life of Baxter was published; in 1820, when the first edition of the Life of Owen appeared, Mr. Orme expresses himself with much greater moderation. “He shows,” says Mr. Orme, speaking of the “Unreasonableness of Separation,” “successfully, that many of the Puritans employed the same arguments against the Brownists which the Churchmen now urged against themselves. It cannot be denied, that on the principle of many of his adversaries, the Dean had the better of the argument.”—*Owen’s Life*, 418. Surely Mr. Orme must have forgotten this passage when he penned the above extracts from the Life of Baxter; or else that retrograde movement, which has effected so much during the last few years among the Dissenters, in converting them from quiet and peaceable religionists into noisy and angry destructives, must have been most signally displayed in the case of Mr. Orme. We, however, have nothing to do with reconciling Mr. Orme in 1820, when the last extract was written, with Mr. Orme in 1830, when the Life of Baxter was published. Our business is to defend the memory of Stillingfleet from such insidious and slanderous attacks.

The “*Irenicum*” was published in 1659, when Presbytery, if any mode of government could at that time be entitled to such a designation, was the Established Religion. There was, however, a prospect of a restoration of the ancient monarchy; and with the Restoration the question of Church Government would naturally be connected. During the preceding years of strife and contention, there had sprung up a race of divines, whose distinguished characteristics were those of moderation in their own views, and forbearance towards those from whom they might differ: and of these divines, Stillingfleet was one of the most illustrious. In this work he endeavours to show, among other things, that Episcopacy was not an antichristian mode of government, as the Presbyterians and Independents had asserted; and that his intentions were of the purest kind, there can be no possible question. In the dedication to an ordination sermon in 1684, he remarks, in reference to the “*Irenicum*,” that he published it, “hoping by it to bring over those to a compliance with the Church of England

(then like to be re-established) who stood off upon the supposition that Christ had appointed a Presbyterian government to be always continued in his Church, and therefore thought prelacy was to be detested as an unlawful usurpation." The book, it must never be forgotten, was written at a period of peculiar religious excitement, and when too no one mode of ecclesiastical government was generally practised; it was intended to unite and not to divide parties: nor could the author have contemplated the fact that this very book would afterwards furnish his enemies with weapons of attack against himself. It doubtless contained some views to which in his more mature years his judgment could not consent; but where is the man whose opinions do not undergo very material changes in the course of time on important subjects: and is a man to be exposed to the charge of inconsistency for such a change of views? In Stillingfleet's case, however, such a palliation is scarcely needed; for while it is admitted that on some points his views did undergo a change, it cannot be denied that the main arguments of his book were those which he maintained and defended during his whole life. Speaking of the work, Stillingfleet himself observes, "There are some things which show his youth and want of due consideration; others in which he yielded too far, in hopes of gaining the dissenting parties to the Church of England. But I dare challenge any man to produce one passage in the whole book that tendeth to encourage faction or schism or opposition to the Church of England; but, on the contrary, I endeavoured to recommend the Episcopal government, as having the advantage of all others, and coming nearest to Apostolical practice." In short, a perusal of the work will prove that the main principles of the book are agreeable to the views that had ever been entertained by the most faithful sons of the Anglican Church.

When the obnoxious Sermon on the "Mischief of Separation," and the larger and still more obnoxious work on "The Unreasonableness of Separation," were published, his enemies, unable to meet him on the fair and open ground of polemical discussion, resorted to the method of attack to which we have already alluded, and sought to convict him of the crime of apostasy from his former principles, as developed in the "Irenicum." The same method of attack is, as has been stated, resorted to, with all possible rancour, by Mr. Orme, who, as has been usual with Stillingfleet's traducers, contents himself with assertions, without attempting even the shadow of a proof. Let however the *Irenicum* be compared with "The Unreasonableness of Separation," and no disagreement will be found to exist: on the contrary, it will appear, on an impartial examination, that the

principles of the latter work flow from those which are laid down in the former. In the "Irenicum" he contends that the Church may lawfully decide on such matters as rites and ceremonies: it follows from such a principle that the voice of the Church should be regarded by the people for the general good, and that strife and division should be avoided by a willing obedience being rendered to the ecclesiastical authority. Such is the principle of the "Irenicum." When, therefore, the state of the Church was settled by due course of law, Stillingfleet charged the Dissenters with schism for wishing to disturb the peace of the Church about matters which, even according to their own confession, were not sinful. Could he, on the principles of the "Irenicum," have hesitated to pronounce the condemnation of separation? Fortunately the memory of Stillingfleet is not likely to suffer from the attacks of such assailants: but it excites our indignation to find men in the present day renewing the oft-repeated charge of inconsistency against a man, who, in all the essentials of sound learning and truly Christian practice, soars to a pinnacle which his traducers can never hope to reach.

We now take our leave of Mr. Orme's volumes. They have been some time before the public, and were it not for the reputation in which they are still held among the great mass of Dissenters, by whom they are viewed as impartial histories of the period, and a faithful exposition of their sentiments, we should not have deemed them deserving of our notice. In the estimation of many persons, Dissent, in consequence of its supposed affinity to the principles of the Non-conformists, is invested with a sort of sacredness, to which it has no pretensions whatever. It is the tendency of Mr. Orme's volumes to foster this notion, the fallacy of which we have, as we verily believe, succeeded in demonstrating. As every effort is made by Dissenters to vilify the clergy and misrepresent the principles of the English Church, while at the same time it is attempted to array Dissent in the most lovely and attractive colours, it becomes our duty to unmask the pretensions and to expose the sophistry of those writers, who, like Mr. Orme, are accustomed to substitute daring assertions and angry invectives in the place of truth and impartiality.

We have ventured to give expression to our dissent from some few of Mr. Short's statements: we entertain the hope too, that in another edition, the able author will consider our suggestions and modify those views against which our objections are levelled. We are however so fully convinced of the value of Mr. Short's work, that we are anxious to see it extensively circulated: nor do we hesitate to express our decided conviction that no other work on the subject of English Ecclesiastical History is so well suited

to the circumstances of those for whom it was principally intended by the author, namely, candidates for holy orders. The reader will discover a striking difference in the tone and spirit of Mr. Short and Mr. Orme. The work of the former is distinguished throughout for the strictest honesty and the most rigid impartiality, which appear the more conspicuous when contrasted with the dishonesty and sophistry so signally displayed in the volumes of the latter. It is quite refreshing, after rising from the task of perusing such works as those of Mr. Orme, to turn to the pages of Mr. Short, who, so far from sacrificing truth to the interest of the Church of England, has rather erred, if indeed he is chargeable with error, in allowing too much credit to the misrepresentations of her enemies.

ART. IV.—*The Vicar of Wrexhill.* By Mrs. Trollope. 3 vols. Small 8vo. Bentley. 1837.

It has been our misfortune, on more occasions than one, to differ with those members of our communion who constitute what is popularly called the evangelical party in the Church of England. We might, even now, if we were so minded, specify several points in which, whatever good the clergy and laity attached to that party may have done by stimulating and keeping alive a general spirit of piety, they have pursued neither a wise nor regular course, nor one tending to the peace, and steadfastness, and safety of the establishment. Their theology has oftentimes appeared to us narrow and exclusive, forgetful of the great and cardinal truth, that "*all Scripture is profitable*;" and therefore of necessity, exaggerated and overdrawn in the things which it stated, because deprived of the counterbalancing power of the things which it omitted. Their modes of agency have oftentimes appeared to us injurious, as calculated to produce disunion and weakness; more particularly, those close leagues which have sometimes occurred, of alliance defensive and even offensive with Dissenters, in opposition to their brethren within the pale of the Church. Their views as to Church discipline, and Church authority, have oftentimes appeared to us to be loose and defective; and their views as to general politics, to be tinged with extravagance and violence. Let it be added, that they have oftentimes appeared to us to exercise over the mind of our female population an influence neither the most judicious nor the most salutary.

We state these opinions, as we have stated them before, with perfect frankness; for we believe the case to be one in which the candid and temperate exposition of sentiment is more useful in itself and more likely to bring about harmony in the end,

than their over-cautious suppression. But, in any controversy into which we have felt ourselves compelled to enter, we trust that we have exhibited a spirit of courtesy and kindness; except, perhaps, on some few occasions, when the outrageousness of attack rendered forbearance impossible, and really called for a spirited and almost indignant defence. Nor even on these occasions, we trust, have we been betrayed by the bitter folly of individuals into general aspersions upon the body. We have uniformly *distinguished*; we have uniformly and most cheerfully acknowledged, that there exist in the evangelical section of the Church of England many, very many men, who would do honour to any religious community upon the face of the earth; men, whose general conduct all might be proud to imitate, and whose Christian spirit all might be happy to imbibe: and between these men and their (so-called) orthodox brethren, there remain, we are verily persuaded, few, if any, matters which are not fairly capable of accommodation and adjustment.

Still, as long as any differences continue, our attitude, we are aware, must be sometimes one of apparent hostility; because our side is taken, and we cannot be on both. None, however, we trust, except perhaps Mrs. Trollope herself, will imagine that, on this account or on any other, such a production as "*The Vicar of Wrexhill*" could find favour in our eyes. Our remarks, we trust, have never had any thing in common with a work, written, we are compelled to think, neither conscientiously nor charitably; neither with Christian kindness, nor with justice to others, nor even, it may be, with good faith, as far as the author's own convictions are concerned.

Mrs. Trollope is a bold writer. She began with attacking the Americans, *genus irritabile*, a generation the most sore and sensitive upon earth, and quite disposed to retaliate, if any lady or gentleman should go over and take an unfavourable likeness of them, without even asking them to sit for the picture. She now attacks the "*Evangelicals*," a body influential and united, and altogether competent, if so inclined, to make vilifiers and calumniators feel the weight of their resentment. What a pity it is, with so much boldness, that, in the better part of valour, Mrs. Trollope is so utterly deficient. She has about as much of discretion, as Christmas-day has of sun at the north pole.

Ladies, we must say, when they wish to make a particular impression upon the public mind, are sadly given to exaggeration. Mrs. Sherwood lately indulged us with a delineation of a High Churchman,—a task which she achieved by mixing up the most hideous hues almost at random, splashing and daubing away, as if an innkeeper had requested that, for a proper consideration, she

would paint him *a Saracen's head*. Mrs. Trollope now affords us a companion picture, which fairly out-Herods, or out-Sherwoods, Mrs. Sherwood.

We had heard that this tale was a performance of some interest, turning upon religious peculiarities. We therefore read it—albeit not much in the habit of perusing this class of works—in the hope that we might gather some accurate information, or some useful admonition, conveyed in the form of a narrative. Let us be quite candid. We might have deemed it—for persons who could like the employment—an occupation of their time, not altogether unserviceable, to *show up*, in a moderate and discriminating way, an officious and meddling parson, *leading captive silly women*; sowing schism, disunion, and discomfort in a parish or a family; striving to bring into contempt the more quiet and unostentatious ministrations of his predecessor; courting popularity and authority by plausible artifices; and endeavouring to become the absolute pope, the spiritual and temporal dictator, of a neighbourhood. Yet we ought not here to have expected any thing like moderation or discrimination, with the recollection of Mrs. Trollope's former volumes in our minds. This publication, at least, has completely undeceived us. What respect can we have for a writer, who is a mere caricaturist, and whose caricatures always lean to the side of the bitterest ill-nature? What respect can we have for a writer, who dips her pen in the blackest venom of calumny for the sake of catching a few readers the more? This work, we fear, like the old razors, is made merely *to sell*. Mrs. Trollope does not warn, but she misrepresents: she does not unmask, but she libels. Yet we would fain hope, though almost against hope, that she has *meant well*: that from an unfortunate habit, or from some mental fault, or obliquity of intellect, she actually sees all things through an exaggerating and distorting medium; that there is some strange malformation in the *retina* of her imagination or her judgment; and that she imposes upon herself before she attempts to impose upon others. However, that she *has done ill*, we have no question. Whether, amidst much mischief, some little *modicum* of collateral or incidental benefit may, or may not, result even from this production, we shall not inquire: but we are sure that the slight infusions of probability or reality, which may occasionally be traced in it, do not make the misrepresentations less odious.

Yet, we understand, its circulation has been considerable. And this circumstance, in addition to other reasons, the chief of which is a strong disinclination to wade again through the mire of its contents, dissuades us from undertaking any regular analysis. Suffice it to say, that it is a novel in three volumes, garnished with

illustrative engravings, one or two of which might put even Mrs. Trollope herself to the blush.

It would almost appear that Mrs. Trollope had a map or catalogue of human vices before her, and, lest she should be accused of partiality in her selection, had determined not to omit one in her description of an evangelical clergyman. So, when the greater and more atrocious crimes have taken their station, the smaller and meaner are admitted to a place. Lest it should not be enough to make the Vicar of Wrexhill a wholesale scoundrel, he must also be represented as a petty rogue. Lest it should not be enough to make him harsh, tyrannical, and overbearing, he must also be represented as supple, oily, insinuating, and cowardly. Lest ambition and the lust of power should be thought to monopolize a heart capacious of all evil, room must likewise be found for the love of sloth and indolence, the love of "*creature-comforts*," the love of eating and drinking—the good dinner—the luxurious arm-chair,—and the two or three glasses of negus on the sofa of the dressing-room before going to bed. Contraries are to meet; and opposites to mingle; and, if a quality is but base, Mrs. Trollope's hero is by no means to be defrauded of its possession.

For ourselves, we are happy to say, that we never met with such a miscreant, or any the slightest approach to such a miscreant, as this Mr. Cartwright, in the religious world. But if we conceive, just for the sake of argument, that one such being could be discovered, still the description could answer no salutary purpose; since it would afford no example, no moral lesson to the generality; because it would only represent the single monster of his kind. There may be, we altogether believe, a high moral utility in works of fiction. But ethical fiction, in order to be useful—to serve some higher end than the gratification of curiosity, or the excitement of wonder—to advance the sacred cause of truth and virtue, must present, not a *lusus naturæ*,—for such things ought to be relegated to some medical, or physiological, or metaphysical history, which treats of aberrations and prodigies,—but a fair specimen of humanity in one or other of its aspects: it must present to us, not a solitary individual, but the personification of a class; it must present to us passions and events, such as may be frequently called forth on the open theatre of life, and actions such as similar circumstances are always likely to reproduce. Otherwise, we derive no instruction, we receive no warning; for we are reading of things in which we feel that we have no concern.

Wherefore, in sitting down to the perusal of any novel or tale, either we fancy that we discern a particular account of some one

living person under a fictitious name, in which case literature degenerates into mere satire and scandal; or else, seeing the futility of a merely individual picture, we *generalize* the characters as a matter of course, and almost as a matter of necessity. And hence comes the unfairness of giving a single portrait, a single *biography*, when it is sure to be enlarged by the mind of the reader into a general history. But, in point of fact, Mrs. Trollope herself generalizes in every chapter of her three volumes. She evidently means to depict, not an individual, but a *genus*. Mr. Cartwright is evidently intended to be, not one isolated evangelical vicar, but a representation of the class of evangelical vicars. Miss Fanny is evidently intended as a representation of the class of evangelical young ladies, who slide by insensible degrees through the pious into the amatory; and sing hymns where the devotional is a plagiarism from the erotic; and fall in love with the too interesting parson, who debars them from other emotions than those which his own mingled tenderness and spirituality can gently but deeply stir. So we have also, as representatives in their way, the evangelical widow in a country town, the evangelical attorney, the evangelical apothecary, the evangelical curate, the evangelical missionary, the evangelical assemblage at the *fancy fair*, the evangelical butler, down to the evangelical stable-boy. And in all these characters, throughout all their sayings and doings, there is scarcely one redeeming point amidst the mass of rascality and turpitude: with the exception of the feeble persons, who are themselves deceived and betrayed, there is not one touch of charity or honesty, of sincerity or kindness of heart. The whole, from beginning to end, is one sickening scene of ostentation pretending to be piety, of imposture triumphing over credulity, and craft taking advantage of enthusiasm, and villany fattening upon folly.

The grand *rôle*, however, is played by the Vicar of Wrexhill himself. And here we must descend a little into particulars, in order to convey at all a correct idea of this precious production, which Mrs. Trollope, in accordance with her notions, ought to have called "*the school for Evangelicalism*." Mr. Cartwright is introduced to the vicarage through the influence of a powerful patron, in opposition to the superior claims of the son of the late incumbent. This late incumbent, together with his whole mode of preaching and proceeding, the successor immediately begins to disparage and decry, setting up the bright radiance of his own spiritual illumination in contrast with the previous darkness of formality and legality. Of course, therefore, he fills the unhappy place, in the first instance, with discord and division, and then with spiritual pride and rancour, and an arrogant dissatisfaction

with the old ways of the Church. Smooth, bland, and affable, with a handsome countenance, fine teeth, an expressive smile, a soft voice, and a gracious demeanour, the polished hypocrite yet comes into the village, almost like a wild beast intent on rapine, insidious as a serpent, and merciless as a tiger. At this period, however, he is embarrassed by debts and difficulties; and one of his great objects is to retrieve his affairs by preying on the superstitious and susceptible. For this purpose, among others, he strains every nerve to obtain a complete mastery over the female population of Wrexhill, till he gradually impregnates its entire atmosphere with seduction and pollution. His conversation with the ladies consists of dangerous compliments and illicit proposals, couched sometimes in scriptural phraseology, and always in a kind of religious cant. On the rest of the inhabitants, he fawns or tramples, as circumstances admit; and when he deems the sway to be in his own hands, his language is as coarse, brutal, and blasphemous, as his measures are savage, domineering, and oppressive.

But his main object of all is to gain possession of the person and fortune of the rich widow of the squire and landholder of the parish. By a series of abominable devices, he sets her against her children, and half wheedles, half terrifies her into a hasty marriage; next, though in this respect he is afterwards baffled and out-manceuvred through the instrumentality of some subordinate characters, whom the purport of this criticism does not lead us to mention, he causes her to make a will bequeathing her whole property to himself; and then has no scruple in hastening her death by his ill-treatment. Moreover, while the mother, since the money is hers, demands his serious courtship, it is requisite that he should keep himself in practice by inveigling the affections of the daughter—a young, impressible, and religiously romantic girl—through a mixture of fraud and flattery too loathsome to be detailed.

We may add, with regard to his own family, that he is just as exemplary in his parental as in his other relations. His own daughter, who sees through his baseness, and whom his tyranny eventually kills, he horrifies into becoming a confirmed Atheist; while his son, who is of another temperament, is so shamed by his father's conduct out of all serious feelings, that, having been throughout a buffoon and a reprobate, he ends, characteristically enough, by being a strolling player.

But why should we go on? Yet it is bare justice, since our remarks have been severe, to give a few elucidatory quotations. But we should have to transcribe almost the whole work, if we attempted to verify from these three volumes our account of the

hero; or to show how Mrs. Trollope has made him a complete compound of all vices, aspiring and yet sordid, rapacious and yet cunning; his every action the concentrated essence of malice and deceit, his every word softened into the jargon of false piety; his unctuous and treacled discourse framed to entrap and destroy, somewhat like the sticky and cloying mixture placed against a garden wall to catch wasps;—his general conduct the fit counterpart to this talk, smooth as honey, though more bitter than gall, but sometimes breaking out with unrestrained and scurrilous audacity:—a liar, a calumniator, a cringing hypocrite, an insolent bully, a creeping and perjured knave, a licentious sensualist, an impure voluptuary, a self-indulgent epicure: steeped to the very core in impurity and bitterness and worldliness, yet for ever preaching and praying, as if he were already among the elect of heaven, and all the pollutions of earth were cleansed away from his spirit.

Thus, after about five interviews with Mrs. Mowbray, the unfortunate lady against whom Mr. Cartwright entertains his nefarious designs of marriage, the following scene occurs when she is irritated for the moment against Sir Gilbert Harrington, an old friend of the family, and joint executor with herself.

“Mrs. Mowbray wept.—Mr. Cartwright hid his face with his hands, and for some moments seemed fearful of betraying all he felt. At length he fixed his eyes upon her—eyes moistened by a tear, and in a low deep voice that seemed to indicate an inward struggle, he uttered, ‘*vengeance is mine, saith the Lord!*’

“He closed his eyes, and sat for a moment silent, then added, ‘Perhaps of all the trials to which we are exposed in this world of temptation, the obeying this mandate is the most difficult! But like all uttered by its divine author, it is blessed alike by its authority and its use. Without it, my friend, without it, would not my hand be grappling the throat of your malignant enemy? Without it, should I not even now be seeking to violate the laws of God and man, to bring the wretch who can thus stab an angel woman’s breast to the dust before her? But, thanks to the faith that is in me, I *know* that his suspicious heart and cruel soul shall meet a vengeance as much greater than any I could inflict, as the hand that wields it is more powerful than mine! I humbly thank my God for this, and remembering it, turn with chastened spirit from the forbidden task of punishing him, to the far more Christian one of offering aid to the gentle being he would crush. Was it indeed from the lips of your child, my poor friend, that these base aspersions reached you?’”
—vol. i. pp. 169, 170.

Our next extract must be an interview with Miss Fanny, to whom the reverend Vicar is rather fond of paying clandestine visits at every convenient opportunity.

“Fanny was already in the garden when he arrived; and as it so hap-

pened that he saw her as she was hovering near the shrubbery gate, he turned from the carriage-road and approached her.

" 'How sweetly does youth, when blessed with such a cheek and eye as yours, Miss Fanny, accord with the fresh morning of such a day as this. I feel,' he added, taking her hand and looking in her blushing face, 'that my soul never offers adoration more worthy of my Maker than when inspired by intercourse with such a being as you !'

" 'Oh, Mr. Cartwright,' cried Fanny, avoiding his glance by fixing her beautiful eyes upon the ground.

" 'My dearest child, fear not to look at me—fear not to meet the eye of a friend who would watch over you, Fanny, as the minister of God should watch over that which is best and fairest, to make and keep it holy to the Lord. Let me have that innocent heart in my keeping, my dearest child, and all that is idle, light, and vain, shall be banished thence, while heavenward thoughts and holy musings shall take its place. Have you essayed to hymn the praises of your Saviour and your God, Fanny, since we parted yesterday ?'

" This question was accompanied by an encouraging pat upon her glowing cheek ; and Fanny, her heart beating with vanity, shyness, hope, fear, and sundry other feelings, drew the MS. containing a fairly written transcript of her yesterday's labours from her bosom, and placed it in his hand.

" Mr. Cartwright pressed it with a sort of pious fervour to his lips, and enclosing it for greater security in a letter which he drew from his pocket, he laid it carefully within his waistcoat, on the left side of his person, and as near as possible to that part of it appropriated for the residence of the heart."—vol. i. p. 195, 6, 7.

Mr. Cartwright's letter, at vol. i. p. 200—205, to "his cousin and friend, Mr. Stephen Corbold, solicitor," is a rich specimen in its way ; but we must pass on to the place where, as Mrs. Mowbray is about to undertake a journey to London, the vicar "whispers, as he handed her in and pressed her hand,"

" 'Do not fatigue yourself with talking, my dear friend, it is a great while since you have taken a journey even so long as this. In the pocket next you I have placed a little volume that I wish—oh, how ardently—that you would read with attention. Will you promise me this ?'

" 'I will,' replied Mrs. Mowbray, deeply affected by his earnestness. 'God bless you !'

" 'The Lord watch over you,' responded Mr. Cartwright, with a sigh. He then retreated a step, and Helen sprang hastily into the carriage without assistance ; the door was closed, and before the equipage reached the lodges, Mrs. Mowbray had plunged into a disquisition on regeneration and faith—the glory of the new birth—and the assured damnation of all who cannot, or do not, attain thereto."—vol. i. p. 232—233.

To this extract, the following conversation may be fitly appended.

" 'At what age, Mr. Cartwright,' said Mrs. Simpson, 'do you think

one should begin to instil the doctrine of regeneration into a little girl?'

"'Not later than ten, my dear lady. A very quick and forward child might perhaps be led to comprehend it earlier. Eight and three quarters I have known in a state of the most perfect awakening; but this I hold to be rare.'"—vol. i. p. 307.

When the ladies sing sacred music of an evening, the following is a specimen of the *regenerated* hymns, which Mr. Cartwright recommends to his young proselytes,—

"Fly not yet! 'Tis just the hour
When prayerful Christians own the power
That, inly beaming with new light,
Begins to sanctify the night
For maids who love the moon.

Oh, pray!—oh, pray!

"'Tis but to bless these hours of shade
That pious songs and hymns are made;
For now, their holy ardour glowing,
Sets the soul's emotion flowing.

Oh, pray!—oh, pray!

"Prayer so seldom breathes a strain
So sweet as this, that, oh! 'tis pain
To check its voice too soon.

Oh, pray!—oh, pray!"—vol. i. p. 316—7.

This delectable parody is sung in the drawing-room. But the staple commodity of this part of the book may be said to be lonely walks by moonlight, and secret comings and goings, in which pastoral visits are turned into amorous assignations. Some of these are enough to make us sigh for the time, as depicted by those in every way monkish lines, when

"Causa gravis scelerum cessabit amor mulierum,
Colloquium quarum nihil est nisi virus amarum,
Præbens, sub mellis dulcedine, pocula fellis."

Yet we must bear in mind, that the Evangelical Vicar of Wrexhill is represented not merely as a *Dr. Cantwell*, but still more as a spiritual Falstaff, whose aim is to make a property of the ladies whom he courts, while he is debauching their principles and ensnaring their affections. His daughter thus describes him to her friend,—

"'To touch, to influence, to lead, to rule, to tyrannize over the hearts and souls of all he approaches, is the great object of his life. He would willingly do this in the hearts of men, but for the most part he has found them tough; and he now, I think, seems to rest all his hopes of fame, wealth, and station, on the power he can obtain over women. I

say not,' she added, after a pause, while a slight blush passed over her cheek, 'that I believe his senses uninfluenced by beauty—this is far, hatefully far, from being the case with Mr. Cartwright; but he is careful, most cunningly careful, whatever victims he make, never to become one in his own person.

" 'You would find, were you to watch him, that his system, both for pleasure and profit, consists of a certain graduated love-making to every woman within his reach—not too poor, too old, or too ugly. But if any among them fancy that he would sacrifice the thousandth part of a hair's breadth of his worldly hopes for all they could give him in return, they are mistaken.' "—vol. i. pp. 286, 287.

To this "*love making*," however, even prayer is made subservient. Thus, in an extempore address to Heaven, equally conspicuous for its piety and its honesty, or, as we are told, "*perfectly indecent and profane in its impassioned language*," the Vicar drives Miss Fanny *almost into convulsions*, until the door opens, and he is suddenly interrupted. Still he is too skilful in deceit, too practised in intrigue, to be deserted by his presence of mind.

"He did not for an instant suspend the flow of his eloquence, but the style of it altered altogether.

" 'Bless her, Lord! bless this lovely and beloved one!' were the words which preceded the opening of the door, accompanied by the sobbings of vehement emotion. 'Bless all this worthy family, and all sorts and conditions of men; and so lead them home, &c.,' were those which followed, uttered too with very decent sobriety and discretion."—vol. i. pp. 241, 242.

Charming man—exemplary Vicar! We had marked many other passages for citation in the first volume, but we must hurry forward to, and through, the others; for it really is not safe to dwell, in detail, on the progress of this amiable personage.

In the second volume, Mrs. Trollope discovers more plainly the target at which she aims; and shows that she is striking at a party under pretence of describing an individual. She tells us of Mr. Cartwright, at page 11, that "*there are lots of men at Cambridge, who think him quite an Apostle*;" and she makes one of her more respectable characters declare, at page 38, "Mr. Cartwright is one of the Evangelical, decidedly, I believe, the most mischievous sect that ever attacked the Established Church." And again, at pp. 39, 40, "of every family into which this insidious and anti-christian schism has crept, you would find, upon inquiry, that in nine instances out of ten, it has been the young girls who have been selected as the first objects of conversion, and then made the active means of spreading it afterwards." "Mr. Cartwright is what is called "*a shining light*," which means, being interpreted, "*a ranting, canting fanatic*." At page 57, Mr.

Cartwright himself informs Mrs. Mowbray, that he has a peculiar "skill in developing the inward character of those among whom he is thrown; and I cannot," he adds, "but believe that this faculty, which I feel so strong within me, of discerning in whom are those spirits that the Lord has chosen for his own—I cannot but believe that this faculty is given me by his especial will, and for his especial glory." At page 72, Mrs. Trollope finds a pleasure in sneering at Evangelical Societies, and "*evangelical establishments for the instruction of ignorance in infants of four months, to adults of fourscore.*" At page 86, there occurs a stoppage in the journey, in which Mr. Stephen Corbold, the Evangelical solicitor, is accompanying Mrs. Mowbray and her daughter.

"This halt was an agreeable surprise to Mr. Stephen Corbold. It was indeed an arrangement such as those of his peculiar sect are generally found to approve; for it is a remarkable fact, easily ascertained by any who will give themselves the trouble of inquiry, that the serious Christians of the present age indulge themselves bodily, whenever the power of doing so falls in their way, exactly in proportion to the mortifications and privations with which they torment their spirits: so that while a young sinner would fly from an untasted glass of claret that he might not lose the prologue to a new play, a young saint would sip up half-a-dozen (if he could get them), while descanting on the grievous pains of hell which the pursuit of pleasure must for ever bring."—vol. ii. p. 86.

Shortly after, a most instructive conversation occurs between Mr. Corbold and his cousin the vicar of Wrexhill; when "a serious, waggish, holy, cunning smile illuminated the red dry features of the attorney," and both "discern some very singular and remarkable manifestations of the Lord's will." At page 121, Mr. Cartwright, as the impersonation of Calvinism, or what Mrs. Trollope had before facetiously called "*Philo-Calvin Frybabe principles*," says of one of the young ladies, "I won't disguise from you, cousin, that I consider this young person's as a hopeless case. She was foredoomed from the beginning of the world: I see the mark upon her:" and at page 170, we are told of all other feelings being "made to merge in the one overwhelming influence of Calvinistic terror on one side, and Calvinistic pride at presumed election on the other." So again, on another occasion, "Mr. Cartwright hemmed and began—

"I thank thee, O Lord! that by thy especial calling and election, I am placed where so many sinful souls are found, who through and by me may be shown the path by which to escape the eternal pains of Hell. But let thy flames blaze and burn, O Lord! for those who neglect so great salvation! Pour down upon them visibly thy avenging judgments, and let the earth see it and be afraid," &c. &c.—vol. ii. p. 298.

At page 130, Mrs. Trollope reprobates extempore preaching as "a very indecent *innovation*:" which whatever else it may be, and our opinion is on record, it certainly is not. Charles II. was, assuredly, not an Evangelical; and yet, as Mr. Gresley informs us, in his *Ecclesiastes Anglicanus*,

"The witty monarch would, I fear, come under the censure of the historian, as being a 'vulgar' hearer of sermons, if we may judge from the following proclamation, extracted from the statute book of the University of Cambridge.

" ' Vice-Chancellor and Gentlemen,

" ' Whereas his Majesty is informed that the practice of reading sermons is generally taken up by the preachers before the university, and therefore continues even before himself; his Majesty hath commanded me to signify to you his pleasure, that the said practice, which took its beginning from the disorders of the late times, be wholly laid aside, and that the said preachers deliver their sermons, both in Latin and English by memory, without books; as being a way of preaching which his Majesty judgeth most agreeable to the use of foreign churches, to the custom of the university heretofore, and to the nature of that holy exercise: and, that his Majesty's command in these premises be duly regarded and observed, his further pleasure is, that the names of all such ecclesiastical persons as shall continue the present supine and slothful way of preaching be, from time to time, signified to him by the Vice-Chancellor for the time being, on pain of his Majesty's displeasure.

' Oct. 8th, 1674.'

' MONMOUTH.' "

We ought to have mentioned, though it is hardly requisite, that, just before, our authoress had been recurring to her old constant and favourite topic. Mr. Cartwright, we are told, had been seeking to inflame the imaginations of his parishioners.

" Among the females he had been particularly successful; and indeed the proportion of the fair sex who are found to embrace the tenets which this gentleman and his sect have introduced in place of those of the Church of England, is so great, that, as their faith is an exclusive one, it might be conjectured that the chief object of the doctrine was to act as a balance-weight against that of Mahomet, who, atrocious tyrant as he was, shut the gates of heaven against all woman-kind whatsoever; were it not that an occasional nest of he-saints may here and there be found, sometimes in a drum-profaned barrack, and sometimes in a cloistered college, which show that election is not wholly confined to the fair. There are, however, some very active and inquiring persons who assert, that upon an accurate survey throughout England and Wales, Ireland, Scotland, and the town of Berwick-upon-Tweed, no greater number of this sect can be found of the masculine gender than may suffice to perform the duties of ministers, deputy ministers, missionaries, assistant missionaries, speech-makers both in and out of Parliament, committee-men, and such serious footmen, coachmen, butchers and

baker, as the fair inhabitants of the Calvinistic heaven require to perform the unfeminine drudgery of earth."—vol. ii. pp. 128, 129.

In the third volume, at page 29, we read of the misfortunes of poor Mrs. Simpson, "whose example," says Mrs. Trollope, "should be a warning to all widow ladies to be careful how they enter into holy dalliance and sanctified trifling with the regenerated and elect:"—for, as she adds in a strain of high-toned morality, "common prudence, in short, is no fair match for uncommon holiness." The succeeding dialogue between the widow and the vicar must be read to be appreciated. The same remark may apply to the interview between Mr. Cartwright and his step-son; wherein the former says to the latter, who is anxious to go into the army,

"Open not your mouth, young man, in defence of the God-abandoned set to whom you would wish to belong: my ears must not be offended by any words of such abhorrent tendency. Instead of speaking yourself, hear me. My will is, that you return to college, there to prepare yourself for ordination. I utter this command with a conscience void of offence; for, though your awful deficiency in religion is well known to me, I have confidence in the Lord, and in the power he will give me to work a change: and moreover, I know to what bishop I shall send you for ordination; thereby securing to myself the consolation of knowing that no human learning will enable you to be received within the pale that we are strengthening around us, and within which none shall be admitted (if we can help it), but the regenerate and adopted, or such as we of the evangelical church may choose to pledge ourselves shall become so."—vol. iii. pp. 45, 46.

His step-son becomes an exile, and Mr. Cartwright, rejoicing exceedingly at his departure, begins to form plans on an extensive scale. For we read

"This good work achieved, which was of that species permitted by the peculiar doctrine of his sect, Mr. Cartwright, of Cartwright Park, began to look around him among his neighbours and dependents for opportunities of displaying both his sanctity and his magnificence."—p. 57.

He denounces Mr. Marsh the schoolmaster, who dares to be orthodox, and "doubts whether Satan stands ready at the door to seize his soul, and bear it in his poisoned claws to everlasting torture."

"This is terrible!" cried the vicar, starting up and attempting to stop his ears. "Such blasphemy cannot be listened to without sin. I leave you, sir, and I will shake the dust off this your carpet from off my feet. But remember this,—I am your pastor and master, appointed to be the minister and guide of all the souls in my parish unto the presence of the Lord. As for your soul—I have no hope left for it: it

must and it will have its portion among the condemned of the Lord and of his saints, and will exist only to burn in unspeakable tortures for ever."—vol. iii. p. 70.

This village pedagogue Mr. Cartwright soon contrives to ruin: the unhappy man himself is sent to prison; his furniture is seized for taxes: his wife lies ill of a brain-fever in a small adjoining public-house; and the children are starving around her:—which comfortable news the prosperous vicar receives "*with an inward chuckle, which was the hosannah of a fiend.*"

Previously, when the innkeeper had demurred to his command of "forthwith taking down the Mowbray arms, and substituting the *Cartwright* arms," "the imperious great man whose cold outward civility had been long struggling with internal hatred," actually began to climb a ladder for the purpose of tearing away the obnoxious sign with his own hand.

But we are sick of these revolting improbabilities. Otherwise we might proceed to a more particular notice of son Jacob; of the missionary operations, and the project of *sending out to Fababo a remarkably serious young Jew, recently converted*—the sketch or programme of the *serious fête*, with the serious company, and the serious servants, full of "reverential bows and frozen *blandishments*,"—the way in which Mr. Cartwright, "*according to the usual custom of evangelical divines*," collects gossip and scandal, is a breaker and betrayer of confidence—opens the family letter-bag, and re-seals the letters *with considerable mechanical skill*. These, and other exquisite *morceaux*, we must omit; such as meet us in this third volume at page 185, or at pages 212—215; and, still more flagrantly at pages 217, 218. We hardly know whether we are right to extract the parting speech of Mr. Cartwright's wretched daughter, Henrietta.

"Fanny stood apart, and alone; and having looked round upon each of them, the dying girl fixed her eyes upon her father, and thus addressed him:

"I have heard you say—a thousand times perhaps,—that religion was the business of your life; and for that reason, sir, its very name hath become abhorrent to my soul. Oh, father! you have much to answer for! I would have given my own right hand to believe in a good, a merciful, a forgiving God!—and I turned my young eyes to you. You told me that few could be saved, and that it was not what I deemed innocence could save me. You told me too, that I was in danger, but that you were safe. You told me that God had set his seal upon you. And then I watched you—oh, how earnestly: I spied out all your ways!—I found fraud, pride, impurity, and falsehood mix with your deeds through every day you lived! Yet still you said that God had set his seal upon you—that your immortal soul was safe,—that happiness eternal was your predestined doom. I listened to you as a child listens to a father;

not a word was lost ; no, nor an action either. And then it was, father, that I became an unbeliever ! an hardened infidel ! a daring atheist ! If it were true that God had chosen you, then was it true my soul rejected him."—vol. iii. p. 282, 283.

This is enough to make us pause:—we shall not trust ourselves to speak of the horrors of the catastrophe ;—where, however, the Vicar of Wrexhill, though exposed and foiled in his immediate villanies, effects an exchange, "*by the influence of some of the most distinguished of his party, both in religion and politics ;*" but unfortunately does "*not obtain a mitre, though a great many serious people declared that he deserved it.*"

We find, as we look back to the notes which we made in reading these veracious volumes, that we had meant for quotation several other passages ; but we cannot afford room for more extracts, and those which we have given must preclude the necessity of a larger number of specific references. The intention of the book, and the characteristic vices of the hero, as also of his congenial, though subordinate agents, must be sufficiently manifest without them.

We have all read of the lady, who

" So perfect and so peerless was created
Of every creature's best :"

we have heard, too, of Apelles, who, in order to paint an ideal Venus, gathered round him all the living models of loveliness, and blended together the finest lineaments and proportions of the various specimens of Grecian beauty. Mrs. Trollope goes upon the reverse process. She takes all the separate features of hideousness and deformity, and combines them to make up the express image of a Calvinistic clergyman. She collects into her herbal all the poisonous plants with which her science is acquainted ; she distils all their rank juices into one terrible decoction, and then labels it, as it were, with the title of "*Evangelicalism in England.*" "*This is not and it cannot come to good.*" To show the evil lurking in some comprehensive principle, to point out the error of some general system of action, may be a task as necessary as it is disagreeable : but to enter into the details of private life and personal character, for the mere sake of aggravating all that is worst and most hateful, is a work of superfluous unpleasantness, from which Christian prudence, no less than Christian charity, would gladly refrain. As to such matters, God knows, it is better for us all, to lament, with a burning sense of shame, over our own vices and deficiencies, than to cast stones at one another.

Nor let Mrs. Trollope suppose that she is justified by the motto which she prefixes from Molière.

“ Les bons et vrais dévots qu'on doit suivre à la trace
 Ne sont pas ceux aussi qui font tant de grimace.
 Hé, quoi !—vous ne ferez nulle distinction
 Entre l'hypocrisie et la devotion ?
 Vous les voulez traiter d'un semblable langage,
 Et rendre même honneur au masque qu'au visage ?”

With her, all is written, not for truth, but for effect. Every page bears its evidences of a shrewd and inquisitive, but, at the same time, of a coarse, unfastidious, and, must we say it ?—vulgar mind. Many passages are gross in the conception, and of at least very equivocal delicacy in the phraseology. But we will not say more ; for there are expressions which we should be most unwilling to use in reviewing a lady's publication. We need only refer to the scene of private devotions with the Vicar on his knees ; to the scene with Miss Fanny under the lime-trees ; to the scenes, when the lawyer is with the same young lady in the carriage, and afterwards in the house ; as also to a variety of others, which cannot, we think, be very edifying to the rising generation,—not even to any little Master Trollope or little Miss Trollope, if such happen to be in existence. Mrs. Trollope may think—and it is simply on this account that we trouble ourselves with her lucubrations—that she is advocating the cause of genuine religion, by her exposure of the religion which is spurious and counterfeit ; but we would test the matter by the effect which is produced upon the mind of any youthful reader—and it is by youthful readers that novels are devoured—who rises from the perusal of these three volumes.

There is no accounting for the droll notions which people sometimes take in their heads. Mr. Galt says in his *Bogle Corbet*, ‘ I have always been fond of marking my reverence for the Sabbath, by *spending the day* in some short excursion.” Mrs. Trollope, now and then, delivers opinions as to the proper mode of displaying a sense of religion, which seem analogous to this plan of keeping the Sunday holy, by driving over to Richmond, or steaming down to Gravesend. But at such matters we can only glance, and pass forward. Neither can we stop to inquire how far her own sex will be gratified by Mrs. Trollope's description of the fair sisterhood at Wrexhill ;—ladies, who, almost without an exception, figure in these pages, at once as weak in intellect as in sound principles ; not disinclined, if we may borrow the elegant phrase of our authoress, to *holy dalliance* ;—becoming every day, like dead game, more tender and more tainted, till really—but we find an *aposiopesis* absolutely needful, not for the august purpose of introducing a rhetorical figure, but from the sheer difficulty of finishing the sentence without offence.

For a large proportion of the imaginative literature which now

passes current and is applauded, we entertain very little respect in any point of view. We cannot admire, for instance, that morbid strain of melancholy in which lack-a-daisical young ladies deluge us with a flood of verses, that may be best described as *Byron and water*. We cannot admire that absurd style of extravagant rhodomontade, in which some young gentleman performs the most wonderful and impossible feats of strength and activity in the twinkling of an eye, as if it was said, "to leap beyond the moon, walk at seven strides along the stars of the Great Bear, and descend to earth by the Pleiades, was for our hero but the work of a single minute." Still less can we admire the novels of fashionable life, real or pretended, which, besides their general demerit of unfaithfulness and positive vulgarity, always tend to divert the mind from the common interests of universal humanity, and absorb it in the artificial frivolities of a few hundred persons who are supposed, *par excellence*, to constitute the world, as if they were formed of a different and finer clay than their fellow creatures. If we look abroad, we have small sympathy either with the old Kotzebue school of German sentimentalism, or with the schools that have succeeded it; while we can only shrink in unmitigated disgust from those outrageous horrors, equally offensive to good morals and good taste, which characterize the romantic, or more properly, the ruffian school of young France, where adultery and incest, murder and suicide, all vitiated feelings, all disordered fancies, and all unlawful appetites, are the main sources of a diseased and feverish interest, the indulgence of which is in itself almost a crime. But we really doubt whether any of these literary enormities is so deeply to be censured, as the exhibition of a minister of the Christian religion, covered over from head to foot with an entire leprosy of guilt, of which no swindler or usurer, no brigand or pirate, not even that scare-crow of our infancy, Blackbeard, with his whole gang of buccaneers, could altogether be capable; in a word, the gibbeting of a teacher of the Gospel as the incarnation of depravity, animated by that intense hatred of good, which is more than human, and properly belongs to the fiendish or the diabolical.

We again ask, *cui bono*? Many estimable persons in the Church may be grievously pained and wounded: the rest can derive no triumph, or, if they can, it must be a triumph which it is unworthy of them to feel; while infidels will carry the generalization farther than Mrs. Trollope, and find an impersonation of *all* Christian clergymen in the flagitious "Vicar of Wrexhill;" who was the admiration of his "*brother shepherds*," and is made the representative of a party, which all may not know to be declining.

Yet, as has been often said, "none are all evil." Classes of

men, at least, cannot well be entirely possessed by all opposite iniquities, as by a legion of conflicting devils, at one and the same time. The doctrine of human corruption may be sufficiently asserted, without making all the blackest shades of human character to exist altogether without one gleam or particle of light. In fact, Mrs. Trollope's delineation outrages nature as much as it shocks decency and good feeling. We doubt even whether she is serving her own purpose, if that purpose be to write down the Evangelical or Calvinistic party. The exaggeration defeats itself. It causes a re-action in favour of the traduced. It arouses and arms a sense of justice in their behalf. Every honest man sees and feels,

"Quodcumque ostendis mihi sic, incredulus odi."

And, therefore, when any other writer objects to the really objectionable features in (so called) Evangelicalism, it may be a natural impulse to turn away from his statements with disgust, and to suppose that he *Trollopizes*.

But to sum up and conclude: if the entire details were true of any single individual, it would be indecent in any friend of the Church to publish such an account of that one individual. If the several particulars were true of several persons, but were true, collectively, of no one person whatever, it would be an atrocity to publish such an account as the embodiment of a class. If the statements are not in *any* sense true—and gross exaggeration is not truth—we should be sorry to express our opinion of the moral characteristics of the author, if male—and still more, if female,—who could publish such an account for the sake of miserable gain. But beyond even this stage of literary crime, there is one crowning perfidy, one more consummate infamy, from which, we do in our hearts trust, Mrs. Trollope may be completely absolved. That perfidy, that infamy, would be, by the pointed mention of some slight particularity in demeanour, or some unfortunate circumstance in life, to direct the attention of the ill-natured to some actual and individual person, as the possible original of the Vicar of Wrexhill; while in the general character there was no shadow of resemblance.

This work has been pronounced to be very clever. Clever it may be.—But the appearance of cleverness, we apprehend, is greater than the reality. For it is no difficult achievement to gain the credit of cleverness by startling and unmeasured allegations. The majority will seldom inquire whether the drawing is correct; but they are attracted if the colours are vivid, and the figures stand out in prominent relief; and thus are apt to ascribe to the force of talent, what is rather due to the force of effrontery: and many a man has mounted into reputation, at least into a fleeting and unenviable notoriety, by a slashing hardihood of style. Few things,

in fact, are easier than to write strongly and strikingly, if people can bring themselves to write without self-respect or self-restraint. But in all performances which pretend to depict a person or a class of persons, if they are to have any value or any commendation, the first requisite is *fidelity*, and the second requisite is fidelity, and the third requisite is fidelity.—*Rien n'est beau, que le vrai*. If Mrs. Trollope fancies that these volumes are generally calculated to be of use, she is woefully mistaken. If she fancies that they will be acceptable to the High-Church party, and that she is to be thanked by that party for her labours, she is mistaken in a still more lamentable degree: *non tali auxilio*—they will not recognize Mrs. Trollope for an ally. And if she fancies, in consequence of immediate success, that they are such as to keep her in lasting favour with readers and publishers, even here too, we apprehend, she may ultimately find herself mistaken to her cost.

ART. V.—*Sermons on various Subjects*. By the Rev. James S. M. Anderson, M.A., Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen, Chaplain to the Queen Dowager, and Perpetual Curate of St. George's Chapel, Brighton. London: J. G. & F. Rivington, 1837.

If this were the first production of an unknown author, we should have been anxious, as far as our good word might have been of any value, to bring it into notice by a criticism in detail. But Mr. Anderson's name carries with it its own praises in the literary world, and his celebrity as a preacher is sure to attract attention to what he writes. Our task, therefore, may be almost simplified to the mere statement, that the present volume is at least equal to its predecessor; and that it fully sustains the high reputation which Mr. Anderson has acquired. We find here, as before, copious stores of research and information brought to bear, skilfully and unostentatiously, upon the subjects which he discusses: we find the same graceful accuracy of style in the more level parts of exposition and narration, the same affectionate earnestness, the same impressive vigour, in the more solemn and hortatory appeals: we find, too, the same tact and delicacy in combining a due respect for persons of exalted rank with the proper dignity and authority of a Christian minister, who, in all its essential characteristics, has but one mighty message to deliver, whether to rich or poor, noble or peasant, sovereign or subject.

"Comparisons are odious;" and we therefore would avoid them. But we may be allowed to say, that, if other popular preachers

are deemed to surpass Mr. Anderson in passionate eloquence, and the glow of an impetuous imagination, he has, on his side, the advantage in point of judgment and sound taste. Thus, in the published sermons, an account of which was rendered almost needless by their extensive circulation, preached by Mr. Melvill, at Cambridge, in February last, there are many specimens of great power of thought and extraordinary felicity and brilliancy of diction. But heartily as we admire the breathing words, the bold figures, the picturesque images, the forcible reasonings, the rapid, vivid, fervid perorations, there are also, we think, occasional departures from the path of sober discretion. There are many things fanciful, many doubtful, many overstrained, and some unsound. The extreme length, for instance, to which the argument is carried, in favour of the self-evidencing inspiration of the canonical Scriptures, as distinguished from the self-evidencing non-inspiration of the apocryphal, and the complete sufficiency of the internal demonstration as apart from the external, appears to us, like all other attempts at proving too much, quite dangerous, because quite untenable.* Again, in another performance which it is almost superfluous to review, namely, the sixth volume of the

* We do not look in Mr. Melvill for very profound divinity, or very extraordinary erudition: but envy itself must acknowledge his great abilities and his great eloquence. Nevertheless, we have expressed, and we reiterate, our hope that Mr. Melvill will not be taken as a model, either for matter or style, by the young clergymen of our Establishment. Both are, in our honest opinion, as far as parochial ministrations are concerned, not indeed altogether vicious, but still blotted with some essential and capital faults. We have spoken on former occasions of the strained, flowery, trope-studded language, sometimes widely and strangely deficient in plainness and simplicity: and the volume now before us would not justify the repetition. But Mr. Melvill is oftentimes smitten with a desire to discover some unusual subject, and treat it in a new and startling manner. Yet the real difficulty and the real triumph of preaching, is to enforce home upon the mind and conscience, trite, simple, but all-important truths; to urge old topics in common language; and to send the hearer back to his house, awakened, humbled, and impressed; not so much astonished by the blaze of oratory, excited by vehemence of tone or gesture, and captivated into an admiration which seldom goes beyond the words and him who speaks them; but thinking far more of the argument than of the preacher, sensible of his own sins, and anxious to grasp the proffered means of salvation. To say the same things which the best and most pious ministers of Christ's church have said from the beginning, to tread in their path, to follow their footsteps, and yet not servilely to copy or verbally to repeat them; to take the same groundwork, and yet add to it an enlarged and diversified range of illustrations, brought up as it were to the age, and adapted to time and circumstance:—this is, we think, the true originality of the Pulpit. To be on the watch for striking out some novel method of display,—to dash into the fanciful, because it is an arduous task to arrest the same eager notice by the familiar—this is not originality, but mannerism or singularity. And although few can be original, nothing is more easy than to be singular.

Such attempts, in fact, are the part of a second-rate understanding, no less than of an ill-regulated ambition. Mr. Melvill should quite repudiate them: and these remarks, we ought, in justice, to say, are far more applicable to a sermon surreptitiously printed in *The Pulpit*, on Satan as the "*Prince of the power of the air*," than to any which Mr. Melvill has recently published in his own name.

collected works of Dr. Chalmers, containing the "*Discourses on the Application of Christianity to the Commercial and Ordinary Affairs of Life*," we find innumerable traces of that fertility of mind, and that cogency of address, and that splendour of language, in which the author is, perhaps, unrivalled among the writers of the day. But we likewise meet with blemishes and extravagances of style, any general imitation of which would inevitably lead to the degeneracy and corruption of our literature. For example, Dr. Chalmers is animadverting on the bad habit of telling servants to say "*not at home*," when the master or mistress of the family is really within doors: and also on the evil custom of a tradesman in saying, that he has no more of such or such goods in hand, when the truth is that he is unwilling to trust his customer to any farther extent. Let our readers observe, in what a strange disguise of tawdry magnificence Dr. Chalmers dresses out and embellishes these homely and somewhat common-place propositions.

"Now, what we call upon you to mark, is the perfect identity of principle between this case of making a brother to offend, and another case which obtains, we have heard, to a very great extent among the most genteel and opulent of our city families. In this case, you put a lie into the mouth of a dependent, and that, for the purpose of protecting your substance from such an application as might expose it to hazard or diminution. In the second case, you put a lie into the mouth of a dependent, and that, for the purpose of protecting your time from such an encroachment as you would not feel to be convenient or agreeable. And, in both cases, you are led to hold out this offence by a certain delicacy of temperament, in virtue of which, you can neither give a man plainly to understand that you are not willing to trust him, nor can you give him to understand that you count his company to be an interruption. But, in both the one and the other example, look to the little account that is made of a brother's or of a sister's eternity; behold the guilty task that is thus unmercifully laid upon one who is shortly to appear before the judgment-seat of Christ; think of the entanglement which is thus made to beset the path of a creature who is unperishable. *That, at the shrine of Mammon, such a bloody sacrifice should be rendered by some of his unrelenting votaries, is not to be wondered at; but that the shrine of elegance and fashion should be bathed in blood—that soft and sentimental ladyship should put forth her hand to such an enormity—that she who can sigh so gently, and shed her graceful tear over the sufferings of others, should thus be accessory to the second and more awful death of her own domestics—that one who looks the mildest and the loveliest of human beings, should exact obedience to a mandate which carries wrath, and tribulation, and anguish, in its train—O! how it should confirm every Christian in his defiance to the authority of fashion, and lead him to spurn at all its folly, and at all its worthlessness.*"—pp. 172, 173.

The latter sentences of this extract are almost in the worst

style of pulpit declamation : while other parts of the volume are so admirable, that scarcely any other man in the empire, except Dr. Chalmers, could have written them.

Mr. Anderson's first sermon is on Conscience ; and it is perhaps, the more useful, that it is practical rather than speculative, and does not pretend to sound all the depths of the controversy. The matter, indeed, if philosophically considered, may soon become involved in a web of metaphysical difficulties, where, as usual, the confusion of ideas and the ambiguity of language act and re-act upon each other. The definitions given of conscience are scarcely ever the same : men differ as to what it is, and as to what it does : and, for the most part, instead of accurate analysis, we have vague expressions about the internal monitor, and the tribunal within the breast. Sometimes conscience is regarded as an intellectual faculty, sometimes as a moral sense, and sometimes as both ; sometimes as the accuser that impeaches the culprit ; sometimes as the jury, that discusses and finds the verdict ; sometimes as the judge, who pronounces the sentence whether of acquittal or condemnation ; and sometimes, as at once accuser, and jury, and judge, and executioner of vengeance. Or, if we take it, generally, as a moral sense, then the word *sense* itself becomes equivocal. With some it is an active power : with others it is a mere feeling. With some it is the test of vice and virtue ; it distinguishes between right and wrong : with others, it only marks *our apprehensions* of right and wrong ; or it is the subsequent perception, of pain or pleasure, the emotion, or impression, which approves or reprobates, when the practical reason has already discriminated.

Nor is it possible, perhaps, entirely to separate these things, or draw an exact line of demarcation between them : since, in truth, the divisions, into which we distribute the powers, qualities, and operations of our mental and moral being, are rather convenient for the purposes of mutual explanation, than actually existent in the nature of man. We even doubt whether all the perplexities of the matter can ever be removed to our mortal comprehension, notwithstanding the mighty multitude of pages which are written from year to year, notwithstanding the labours of Bishop Butler on the subject, and the somewhat cloudy magnificence in which Dr. Chalmers has enrobed it. The comfort is, that, although metaphysicians may stumble, and be bewildered, and grope in the dark, sincere and humble Christians can hardly miss their way : although utilitarians may puzzle us for a moment, a man may receive light enough for his direction through life, as soon as he looks honestly into himself and into the Bible. This salutary view, which is, however, by no means shallow, is taken by Mr. Anderson, to whose judicious discourse we would refer our

readers, instead of attempting to pursue the topic through all the intricacies and subtleties, to which it might lead.

The second sermon, on that familiar and striking text, "*work out your own salvation with fear and trembling; for it is God that worketh in you both to will and to do,*" is eloquent and valuable, like the rest. Nor are we aware, that it makes any doctrinal assertions, as to "*the grace of God, and the agency of man,*" which are not sound and orthodox, and fully borne out by the general sense of Holy Writ. Yet we have always deemed, that this very common text, on account of the inaccuracy which, in its present form, it involves, is a signal example of the use, or rather the necessity, of looking to the Epistle, or at least the entire passage, instead of detaching a particular sentence—or part of a sentence—in an arbitrary and almost violent manner. For the words, "*work out your own salvation with fear and trembling; for it is God that worketh in you both to will and to do,*" always, as it appears to us, cause a misapprehension, more or less, when they are separated from the context, and stand by themselves, as if they constituted the whole proposition laid down by the Apostle. They thus seem to imply—and some excellent commentators, we allow, maintain this construction to be the correct one—that an opposition is expressly stated between man's working and God's working. But is this really the antithesis, which, in strict philology, the passage *alleges*? We think not. St. Paul is writing to the Philippians from his confinement at Rome. But, although he was then "*in bonds,*" he expresses his confident hope of "*coming to them again:*" and he adds, c. 1, v. 27. "*Only let your conversation be as it becometh the Gospel of Christ; that, whether I come and see you, or else be absent, I may hear of your affairs, that ye stand fast in one spirit, with one mind striving together for the faith of the Gospel.*" He exhorts them, in the noblest language, and on the sublimest motives, whether his presence must be withdrawn, or not, to persevere in unity and holiness among themselves: and sums up his argument, by saying, "*Wherefore, my beloved, as ye have always obeyed, not as in my presence only, but now much more in my absence, work out your own salvation with fear and trembling, for it is God that worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure.*" It is almost as if he had said, "*I may be in prison and at a distance; I may not be able to assist you with my personal example and advice; but there is one far mightier than I: and, therefore, do you exert yourselves, for the most High God is your fellow-worker, by his preventing and co-operating grace.*" The opposition, therefore, is, in point of fact, if we regard the grammatical structure of this portion of the Epistle, not so much between the Divine agency

and man's agency, as between the Divine agency and St. Paul's; and the Philippian converts are encouraged to work and strive, because God's working in their behalf, of his sovereign and gracious pleasure, is infinitely more powerful and more efficacious than the Apostle's. We repeat, that the doctrine asserted by Mr. Anderson is altogether Scriptural, and even substantially contained in this very place: but we also contend, that, by insulating the text, and beginning in the middle of the 12th verse, something of misconception is produced, and some violence is done to the principles of grammar, and the canons of just criticism.

But it is impossible for us to go through these sermons one by one, however well they might deserve a separate examination. We turn, therefore, to the fourth, which strikes us as embracing views at once correct and lofty on a most important theme. The text, indeed, condenses into a very brief sentence the whole truth and marrow of an elaborate disquisition,—“*Let a man so account of us, as of the ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God.*” Yet there are many reasons why a good popular address—really a *concio ad populum*—on the duties and prerogatives of Christian ministers would be an essential service both to the people and the Church. Few subjects can be named, on which it more concerns the bulk of a Christian community to have definite and correct notions; yet, there is scarcely any on which their actual notions are more loose and inaccurate. The multitude are for ever oscillating between opposite extremes; now treating the Clergy as their “*hired servants*,” now investing them with a plenary power and jurisdiction, which cannot be attributed without idolatry, save to God himself: now vilifying and decrying them as beings dependent at best upon the breath of a congregation; now exalting and magnifying them into infallible oracles, and almost into absolute deities;—the same persons, perhaps, passing from ribald contempt to superstitious dread and veneration, as their vices predominate, or the fears which are the consequence of their vices. Who indeed can have been practically acquainted with our parishes, whether in town or country, or have closely observed the life and death of their poorer inhabitants, without perceiving how wild, incoherent, and contradictory, are the sentiments still too often prevailing as to the office and privileges of the priesthood? A man shall have been, through long years of rude and boisterous health, a drunkard, a Sabbath-breaker, a blasphemer, a licentious scoffer at parsons and their mummeries, and then he will be frightened beyond measure as he is seized by a sharp and fatal distemper: or else his family will send, in hurried consternation, for the minister, and beg that he would “*say a few prayers over*” their expiring relative; prayers, it may be, which the being whom

they should most interest can no longer understand or even hear ; or that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper should be administered, without an hour's preparation, to the insensible and unhappy wretch who never thought of receiving it before ; when his impotent hand can no longer be stretched forth to take the bread, and the wine can scarcely be poured through the pale and convulsed lips, on which the hues of death are settling. And this, they dream, can be efficacious to the saving of his soul ; and they can urge the minister to read the comfortable words of forgiveness and absolution from " The Order for the Visitation of the Sick ;" quite forgetting that this pardon is contingent upon the previous fulfilment of certain conditions, and is only to be read by the minister when the spiritual state of the sick person has been in some measure ascertained ; quite forgetting, too, that after all, it is but *declaratory* on the part of the minister, " in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost ;" for that God indeed " hath given power and commandment to his Ministers, to *declare* and *pronounce* to his people, *being penitent*, the absolution and remission of their sins ; but that He himself, and He only, pardoneth and absolveth all those that truly repent and unfeignedly believe his Holy Gospel." God forbid that we should deny, or even seem to disparage, the value of spiritual consolation about the bed of disease and dissolution : yet, alas, a wrong estimate of the functions of the Christian priesthood *may* so transmute them into instruments of evil, that while they are of no real benefit to him who is passing away, they shall be actual snares and stumbling blocks to the survivors, actual encouragements to them to continue in a life of sin, with a belief that they may yet die the death of the righteous. While men require to be told that the commission of " the ministers of Christ, and the stewards of the mysteries of God," is a high, and solemn, and holy, and Apostolical thing,—they also require to be told, that if they hope for salvation, it is not the minister who can save them ; but that they must strive for themselves, and pray for themselves, and have faith for themselves, and repent for themselves. It is a strange phenomenon to behold, together with that intense hatred of Popery which usually burns in the mind of our population, how many relics of Popery still survive, lingering, as it were, in the sheltered nooks of ignorance and prejudice ; as the snow, when the sun has warmed the more level and open spaces, may be seen, sometimes late in the spring, lying at the side of the hedges, or by the brow of the hills.—But it is time to return to Mr. Anderson, whose sermon will be found a good corrective of the contrary extravagances which we have mentioned.

The discourses preached on particular occasions are generally,

perhaps, as excellent as any others in the volume; and we may specify the eighth, delivered shortly after the Confirmation of Prince George of Cambridge; and the last, "on the Death of his late Majesty, King William the Fourth," as exemplifying our preceding remark as to the skill and discernment of Mr. Anderson, in harmonizing the sacred functions of an ambassador of the King of kings, into the respectful deference which is due to temporal dignities. As, however, we have room for only one quotation, we prefer to make it from the sermon on "*Ezra reading the law*;" as it may serve to show how fine and graphic is our author's treatment of a subject which might appear at first sight somewhat unpromising.

"The reading of the Law, in fact, revealed to the eyes of Israel a spectacle, the same in kind as that which had overwhelmed with awe the spirits of the Patriarch, the Prophet, the Apostle. It was the spectacle of Jehovah's creative glory, Jehovah's avenging power, Jehovah's redeeming mercy. They saw there His gracious counsel calling their great ancestors to the knowledge of His will, giving unto them the promise of His covenant, and sealing that covenant with the solemn token of his own appointment.* They saw there that 'a Syrian ready to perish had been their father,' that he had gone 'down into Egypt, and sojourned there with a few, and had become there a nation, great, mighty, and populous.'† They saw there, further, that, from the tyranny of Egyptian bondage, the Lord had brought them forth 'with a mighty hand, and with an outstretched arm, and with great terrible-ness, and with signs and with wonders.'‡ Amid those wondrous signs they saw judgments mingled with mercies;—the waters standing on an heap as a way for the ransomed to pass through; the pillar of fire and of cloud; the manna falling from heaven; the water flowing from the Rock; the Law proclaimed amid the terrors of Sinai; the tabernacle appointed with its sacred ordinances; and the terror of opposing enemies baffled and confounded. These were the miracles of God's love; and alas! with these they saw also the signs of His righteous anger;—the Sabbath-breaker stoned; the leprous Miriam; the yawning earth; the fiery serpents; the wasting pestilence. Still they looked onward, and saw there the onward course of God's good promise;—the land flowing with milk and honey; their fathers entering therein; and receiving for their portion 'great and good cities which' they had builded not, 'and houses full of all good things,' which they had filled not, 'and wells digged' which they had digged not, 'vineyards and olive trees' which they had planted not;§—and notwithstanding that they forgot and transgressed His word, they saw God still bearing with them, still multiplying His acts of goodness, still sending unto them all His 'servants the prophets, daily rising up early and sending them.'|| Was not this a picture fitted to subdue the spirits, and to call forth the tears of those

* See Genesis, chapters xii. xv. and xvii.
§ Deut. vi. 10, 11.

† Deut. xxvi. 5.
|| Jer. vii. 25.

‡ Ibid. 8.

who gazed upon it? To see God's vineyard fixed 'in a very fruitful hill;' thus fenced on every side, the stones thereof gathered out, and a tower 'built in the midst of it;' to see it planted with the choicest vine, which, 'when it had taken root, filled the land,' and covered the hills with its shadow, 'and its boughs were like the goodly cedar trees;'—to see all these things, and yet to find that, when the Great Master of the vineyard 'looked that it should bring forth grapes, it brought forth wild grapes,'—what was this but cause for mourning? 'He looked for judgment, but behold oppression; for righteousness, but behold a cry?'* No marvel that the sentence of God's wrath should have gone forth against the place of the vineyard, which His right hand had planted, and the branch which He had made so strong for Himself. No marvel that it should have been burnt with fire, and cut down, and have perished at the rebuke of His countenance.† They who now listened to these revealed counsels of the Lord had known, had seen, had felt their awful reality. They had been driven forth with shame from the gates of Sion, and the chosen city and temple of the Lord had been 'delivered into the hand of the king of Babylon by the sword, and by the famine, and by the pestilence,' ‡ even as His prophets had foretold. In the far off land of their captivity they had suffered the threatened chastisement of the Lord. He had fed 'them with the bread of tears,' and had given 'them plenteousness of tears to drink.' He had made them a very strife unto their neighbours; and their enemies had laughed them to scorn.§ The vineyard, once fenced on every side, 'had been broken down; the wild boar out of the wood had rooted it up; and the wild beasts of the field devoured it.|| 'Turn us again,' then, was the prayer which fell from the hearts and lips of disobedient and chastised Israel, 'turn us again, O Lord God of hosts; shew the light of Thy countenance, and we shall be whole.'¶ And verily their cry had come up before the throne of the Lord of hosts. Their prayer had been answered. He had turned Him again, and looked down from heaven, and beheld, and visited His vine. He had promised that Israel should not be forgotten of Him,** and His promise was accomplished. What though desolation had been spread upon the face of Palestine, and the hand of the Babylonish tyrant stretched out against her children, yet did the Lord redeem Jacob, and 'glorify Himself in Israel.' †† 'The word of His servant' was confirmed, and 'the counsel of His messenger performed,' 'that saith to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be inhabited; and to the cities of Judah, Ye shall be built, and I will raise up the decayed places thereof: that saith to the deep, Be dry, and I will dry up thy rivers; that saith of Cyrus, He is my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure; even saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built; and to the Temple, Thy foundation shall be laid.' ‡‡

"The multitudes who now thronged the streets of Jerusalem had been themselves eye-witnesses of these things. They had seen the pomp of

* Compare Isaiah, v. 1—7. and Psalm lxxx. 8—11. † See Psalm lxxx. 15, 16.

‡ Jer. xxxii. 36.

§ Psalm lxxx. 5, 6.

|| Ibid. ver. 12, 13.

¶ Ibid. ver. 19.

** Isaiah, xlv. 21.

†† Ibid. ver. 23.

‡‡ Ibid. ver. 26—28.

Belshazzar's pride, the destruction of Belshazzar's fall;—the gates that defended him broken through, and the bars of iron cut asunder; the waters of the broad Euphrates dried up; and the hand of the spoiler falling upon the horses, and upon the chariots, upon the treasures, and upon all the mingled people that were in the midst of the idol city.* They had seen these things. They had heard the proclamation of the royal Cyrus, bidding them go forth to Jerusalem; and as, in their hour of distress, the cry for pity and for pardon had been heard among them, so now, 'when the Lord turned again the captivity of Sion, as the rivers in the south, their mouth was filled with laughter and their tongue with joy.'† They had sown in tears, but now they reaped in joy. They had gone on their way weeping, and bearing forth good seed; but now they had come again with joy, and brought their sheaves with them.‡ Behold then the mingled feelings of Israel's people. Behold the record of all these marvellous acts brought, one by one, before them; all that could melt the hardened, or subdue the reckless, or awaken the sluggish, or quicken the faith, and hope, and love of the believer,—and then may you understand the blessed fulness of that consolation wherewith their rulers encouraged them, saying, 'This day is holy unto the Lord your God; mourn not, nor weep. For all the people wept, when they heard the words of the law.'"—pp. 191—196.

In short, all these sermons are well calculated to fix the attention, to impress the mind, and to improve the heart. We like them the better, perhaps, that they form, in general, a continuous strain of argument or exhortation, instead of being divided into three or four laborious ascents to some turgid climax; at the close of which, we should expect that there would be a clapping of hands, or a sound of *Hear, hear*, to attest the power of the preacher. We like them the better that they are not mere declamations in the *sky-rocket* style, where the whole harangue is to fizz and flare with brilliant flashes and astonishing coruscations, till, at the end, the orator mounts up upon the lightnings and the thunders of his eloquence; almost, if we may snatch a similitude from the recollections of years long past, like Madame Sacchi, or some other dancer on the tight rope, amidst the blaze and the tumult, the noise and the splendour, of the last fire-works of Vauxhall. Mr. Anderson works up his conclusions to a sufficient pitch of animation; but his aim seems to be, and very properly, as we have already hinted in a note, that he may dismiss his audience rather chastened, affected, and solemnized, than heated, dazzled, or overpowered.

* See Isaiah, xlv. 1—3; Jer. l. 35—38.

† Ps. cxxvi. 1, 2, 5.

‡ Ibid. ver. 6, 7.

ART. VI.—*Two Memorials, addressed to the General Meeting of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, on the alleged corrupt Character of some of its Publications.* London: Seeley. 1837.

A DROP of cold water, thrown in the playful wantonness of power, has before now led to the dissolution of committees and councils of state. A drop of cold water, thrown in sober sadness on the project of five Essex ministers, has raised a ferment, which nothing but the remodelling of a great ecclesiastical body can appease. The provocation given for presenting these two memorials, appears to have been no more than the refusal of the Tract Committee of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, to recommend a reprint of Fox's Book of Martyrs, at the expense of the Society. The exciting cause for publishing them, the refusal of the Standing Committee to sit in conclave and dictate an answer, "grounded on reasons *specific and particular, and entering into the details of the case,*"* to the two documents themselves: which consist of more than one hundred closely-printed octavo pages, and contain the most grave charges against divers eminent prelates and divines of honoured memory in the Church of England, involving the general character of the books and tracts which have been circulated by the Society "for more than one hundred and thirty years."† The total absence of all practical wisdom in the request itself is but an ill omen of the degree of intelligence to be expected in the memorials. But the request being refused, the rejected addresses are here presented to the public; tendered gratuitously to all the district societies throughout the land; and, that none may slight the importance of the question at issue, they are prefaced by a dedication to the throne of majesty itself, to the archbishops, bishops, and clergy, as well as to the general body of members of the Society, whom alone, one would suppose, such a question properly concerns.

What is the end aimed at in this publication? We are told that the "character of the Society" is compromised by the decision of its committee; that an appeal to the members at large was "the only resource" of the memorialists; and that "their object is to improve the constituted agency provided by the Society," in order to "the more effectual dissemination of the truth as it is in Jesus;"‡ in other words, to destroy the confidence which the Society has placed in the body of select members, forming its standing committee;§ and to have that confidence transferred to seven clergymen, "well conversant with the writings of our Re-

* Memorials, p. 106.

† Ibid.

‡ Introduction.

§ P. 107.

formers," who shall review and report upon the publications of the Society, in order to a final decision, what shall be abolished, and what retained.*

Now it must occur to the reader of this solemn statement to ask, first, what particular claim the letter and requisition of five ministers, in the flats of Essex, had to such consideration, that the character of the Society is compromised by the committee's decision. The names of the memorialists are as follow:

"Hastings Robinson, D.D., Rector of Great Warley,
Henry Budd, M.A., Rector of White Roothing,
Guy Bryan, M.A., Rector of Woodham Walter,
Charles Isaac York, M.A., Rector of Shenfield,
Henry B. S. Harris, B.A., Rector of Leaden Roothing."

The first of these gentlemen is little known to the reading public, except by one or two academical publications, written in Latin not remarkably classical, and which, though they may not greatly impeach his usefulness as a parish priest, render his verdict at least questionable, in all such matters as require to be debated by a learned clergy. The second is the author of a set of little tracts entitled "*Helps for the Nursery*;" of which we have only heard that they are intended to convey to those who have the charge of such infantine departments, some peculiar notions on the subject of Christian Baptism. With the names of the remaining three we are entirely unacquainted: they are known probably as praiseworthy ministers in the confines of Leaden Roothing; but we know of no indefeasible claim they could prefer, above all other ministers of Essex or Suffolk, Kent or Christendom, to have repeated sessions of the committee appointed to hear and answer their theological lucubrations.

Secondly, supposing the names of these gentlemen to be ever so distinguished among the masters in Israel, what probability could there have been that a requisition should have been immediately granted, the proposers of which went the length of meditating a radical change in the constitution and character of the Society, accusing its first founders of a deliberate design to disguise and corrupt the doctrines of the Reformation, and prepare the public mind for a countermarch to the camp of Popery? To say nothing of the cuckoo-game covertly attempted by the five members, who, after joining a society, whose principles the act itself should imply that they approved,* would remove the writings of Ken, Patrick, Kettlewell, and Melmoth, to replace them with

* P. 16.

† These gentlemen have, however, a different view of the matter; they endure the burden on their consciences, "simply with the hope of improving the Society's books and tracts," p. 107, i. e. according to their own statement, they are doing evil, that good may come.

"Honest Roger" or "Helps for the Nursery,"—what probability was there that any general meeting or select committee of the Society could have thought themselves justified in passing a public censure on those good men, who, whether mistaken in some of their tenets or not, were the first founders of that system of social co-operation among churchmen, by which, for more than a full century, the translated Bible, the Liturgy, and elementary doctrines of the Church, have been made known, wherever English colonies and commerce have carried the influence of our native land?

The Essex ministers, however, are abashed by no such scruples. They do not intend to confine their efforts for the improvement of the constituted agency of the Society to the publication of these manifestos, but announce their purpose of proposing a resolution, grounded upon them, to a general meeting, as soon as sufficient time has been allowed for their circulation; and in the interim invite other members, individually or collectively, to make known their sentiments to the Society. We shall therefore beg leave to communicate ours through the medium adopted by the five ministers, the public press. We shall offer a few short notes on these memorials, and the design which they avow of restoring true Protestantism from a thralldom nearly double in duration to the Babylonish captivity.

It is well known that so long ago as the year of our Lord 1690, Archbishop Tillotson had proposed to Bishops Burnet and Patrick, a design of getting up a new Book of Homilies, "not intending," as he expressed himself to those prelates,* "to lay aside the book already established, but to add a new one. He thought that the old book was not full enough, and that it was, according to the state of things at the time in which it was composed, fitted chiefly to settle people's minds right with relation to the Reformation, and in opposition to Popery. He thought that such a work had been of great use; but that another Book of Homilies, that should contain a full and plain account both of the doctrinal and practical parts of the Christian religion, was necessary chiefly for the instruction of the clergy, and it might be also a family book for the general use of the whole nation." The plan is detailed at length by Burnet, and was to have comprized a course of doctrine for the year, fifty-two homilies for the Sundays, and ten for some selected festivals and fasts; for which subjects were expressed, suggested chiefly by the services for the day. Among other particulars, "in the six Sundays to Whitsuntide, the doctrine of Justification

* Burnet's Sermons and Essay, 1713, p. 193.

“ was to be explained, and some expressions in the first book,
 “ *that seemed to carry Justification by Faith only to a height that*
 “ *wanted some mitigation*, were to be well examined, and all that
 “ St. Paul had written on that head, both to the Romans and the
 “ Galatians, was to be explained, and reconciled to what [St.]
 “ James wrote on the same subject.”

“ At that time,” says Burnet, “ the King and Queen set out
 “ proclamations against profane swearing, breach of Sabbath,
 “ lewdness, and drunkenness: so the Archbishop put it upon me
 “ to draw, for an essay, homilies on these subjects. He said he
 “ would take a large share of the work to himself; the like also
 “ Bishop Patrick was willing to undertake; and he knew several
 “ persons who had considered some matters relating to this scheme
 “ very critically, to whom he would assign such parts of it, as
 “ they would be both very willing and able to execute well. He
 “ also told me, that he had proposed the design to the pre-
 “ sent reverend and most learned bishop of Worcester, [Lloyd,]
 “ who approved highly of it,” but would take no part except of
 revising and correcting. In due time Burnet made his draft of
 five homilies, which, after Lloyd had corrected them, were shown
 to Tillotson, who according to Burnet, “ was so pleased with
 “ this essay, that he told him he must take for his share the whole
 “ Ten Cominandments.”

On this proceeding the five ministers make the following com-
 ment:

“ Here is a plain and simple detail, given by one of the most active
 originators of this and the sister Society for Propagating the Gospel
 in Foreign Parts, *of the dissatisfaction of the leading Divines of our*
Church in the day when this Society was founded, *with our Homilies*
generally, and with the fundamental doctrine of the Reformation, so
 ably, and lucidly, and perseveringly, and Scripturally insisted on in
 them, viz. Justification by Faith alone: Bishop Burnet expressly stating
 it as the design of the divines of his day, that ‘some expressions in the
 first book that seemed to carry Justification by faith only to a height
 that wanted some mitigation were to be well examined.’ The Homilies
 in the first book here alluded to, as carrying the doctrine of Justification
 by Faith only to a height that wanted some mitigation, are, it is to be
 presumed, the third and fourth; the first of which is usually ascribed to
 the pen of Archbishop Cranmer, and has long been looked upon as one of
 the most elaborate and accurate statements of that doctrine ever pre-
 sented to the Church. That the divines of Bishop Burnet’s day, with
 whom the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge originated, should
 have desired to mitigate the height of the Reformers’ statement of this
 doctrine, is a plain evidence that they had fallen from the purity of
 Christian doctrine as held at the Reformation: the eleventh article of
 our Church marking, with the most explicit approbation, the truth of

the doctrine as expressed in the Homily. Nor does it appear that this design, to mitigate the height of the doctrine of Justification by Faith only, was confined to the most eminent divines of the day in which the Society arose ; such as bishops Tillotson, Patrick, Lloyd, Burnet, &c. but Bishop Burnet affirms that Archbishop Tillotson said ‘ *he knew several persons* who had considered some matters relating to this scheme very critically.’ ”—*Two Memorials*, pp. 5, 6.

They then proceed to give a short extract from Burnet’s second homily, which it is not necessary for us to insert, as we are not aware that these homilies were ever circulated by the Christian Knowledge Society ; but which appears to us by no means unscriptural, stating that “ a man who feels a forgiving temper in himself, may hence gather an argument to plead for forgiveness.” (See the words of our Lord’s prayer, as they stand in St. Luke, xi. 4,) and from Tillotson’s approbation of this doctrine, as well as from the design before announced, “ they submit it has been proved that the first founders of the Society held and recommended a style of divinity directly opposed to the great leading doctrine of the Reformation.”—p. 8.

There are two or three little assumptions in this statement, which it is necessary to consider before we enter on the main question. First, it is assumed that Tillotson was one of the founders of the two sister societies,* The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge was founded in 1698 ; the Gospel Society in 1701 : whereas *Tillotson died in 1694*. It is plain, therefore, that the five ministers have, in this particular, as the French critic says of Canning, poached on the manors of futurity. Secondly, that Patrick, Lloyd, and Burnet were all sympathetic with Tillotson in thinking that some expressions in Cranmer’s homily required to be mitigated : which is only inferred from Burnet’s stating nothing to the contrary. Thirdly, that the several persons whom Tillotson knew, to whom he intended to assign parts of this Apocryphal Book of Homilies, were all, like himself, Jesuits in disguise : which is all assumed from the fact that “ *he knew them.*”

The facts of the case are no more than this ; that Tillotson proposed a new Book of Homilies, and approved of Burnet’s essay towards it when it was done ;—that he spoke of some expressions in the first book of Homilies, not as actually carrying, but *seeming* to carry, Justification by Faith only, to a height that wanted some mitigation ; that he set Burnet to write homilies, not on this subject, but against swearing, sabbath-breaking, lewdness and drunkenness, and was so well pleased with his performance, that he said he wished him to write,—still not upon Justification,

* This is assumed throughout the Memorials. See pp. 20, 24.

but upon the Decalogue. The whole proof of conspiracy then is centred in a remark of Tillotson's made in familiar conversation not pursued into action at all; unless it be evident, that encouraging a set of homilies against the deadly sins, is indicative of a design to restore Popery, and to overthrow the fundamental doctrine of the Reformation.

It may perhaps be surmised, that the design to get up a new Book of Homilies was in itself a proof of an intention to abolish the book of Cranmer and the Reformers. The five ministers have interpreted it so; they call the whole story "a plain and simple detail of the dissatisfaction of the leading divines of the day, (read 'one leading divine',) with our Homilies generally." But as Tillotson expressed no dissatisfaction with the Homilies generally, but only with some phrases used in one Homily,—as he professed that he did not intend to lay aside the book already established, but to add a new one, the inference is most unfair. Unless the Homilies, sanctioned by authority, contain in themselves a complete body of divinity, which, we presume, not even the Essex ministers will contend, an addition to them might be perfectly harmless, and for many reasons desirable. Whether the age of Tillotson was favourable for making such an addition, is another question: the obscurity which has been the lot of Burnet's essay, appears to be an argument to the contrary. Bishop Jebb has recorded his opinion,—and his opinions were not hastily formed,—that there is no reason to regret the "scheme did not succeed: the specimens are dry, jejune, and spiritless."*

As to the proximate cause of the failure, the Essex ministers not having alluded to it, it is necessary we should state the words of Burnet at the conclusion of his preface, from which the above exposition of the plan is taken. "We found," says he,† "*a spirit of opposition and contradiction grew so strong, and it was so much animated and supported, that we saw it was to no purpose to struggle against it at that time.*" It is plain, therefore, that there was at least a large proportion of the "leading divines of the day," who disapproved of a plan which might even seem to throw any discredit on the old Book of Homilies;—that this feeling was so strong and so general, that Tillotson and Burnet were obliged to give way before it; and that it was not till two and twenty years afterwards, that Burnet thought it advisable to recall public attention to the design at all.

The conspiracy, then, of which Tillotson and his confidential friends are accused, is so far from being proved,—the very design, to which such a colour is given, was so entirely abortive,—the

* Practical Theol. vol. ii. p. 305.

† Burnet, as before, p. 200.

evidence of the Essex ministers so entirely breaks down,—that for very pity we could wish to lend them a helping hand, if it could be done without injury to truth. Shall we then confess that Tillotson appears to us to have spoken some things which are questionably expressed on the subject of a Justifying Faith; some things which are not easily reconcileable with the language of the Homilies? We do not say not reconcileable with the doctrine, but with the language; and the language, not of the Articles, but of the Homilies. He no doubt was disposed to qualify or mitigate some expressions in them. We see no manifest treason to the Church of England in this. For as to the Homilies, though we believe the doctrine they contain is “godly and wholesome,” and to be read with the reverence, which is due to all the writings of our Reformers; we are not tied to maintain all that is there said in confirmation of the doctrine, nor to receive their exposition of particular passages in Scripture, as always the best that could be found.* We regard it as most contrary to the intention of the Reformers themselves, as a most injudicious and undue extension of the sanction given them in the Articles, to number them with the symbolical writings of the Church of England. Are we to receive texts from the book of Tobit, as the undoubted teaching of the Holy Ghost?† Are we to be considered as setting our hands to an authentication of the miracles wrought at the tomb of Epiphanius,‡ or the legend of Pope Joan?§ Can we say of Ahab’s repentance, that it was “an humble submission in heart unto God?”|| Are we bound to maintain every pious opinion of our Reformers, as, with Bradford, that there will be a renovation of brute creatures, or, with Latimer, that our Blessed Saviour descended into the place of torments? Let us honour these holy men with the honour which is undoubtedly their due; but let us not blindly take their private opinions as a part of the Catholic Faith by them restored.

But, we confess, Tillotson appears to us to have spoken some things questionably on the doctrine of our Justification. He delivers it as the sum of his doctrine on this point,¶ that “where the Scripture speaks of Justification by faith, it speaks not of a bare appropriation of the grace and mercy of the Gospel; that is, in plain English, it is not justifying faith to believe that I am pardoned and justified, nor to have a full assurance of this.” (So

* See Bishop Pearson’s Tract, “No Necessity of Reformation in the Doctrine of the Church of England.” 1660. pp. 9, 10.

† See Homily of Almsdeeds. Part ii. p. 235. ed. 1673.

‡ Against Peril of Idolatry. Part ii. p. 113.

§ For Whitsunday. Part ii. p. 285.

|| Of Fasting. Part i. p. 175.

¶ Sermon ccxvii.

far he is undoubtedly right; for even the Calvinistic prelates, Davenant and Prideaux,* agree with him in this.) “For if we be justified by faith, we must believe before we can be justified; but if this be justifying faith to believe or be assured we are justified, we must be justified before we believe; or else, when we believe that we are justified, we must believe that which is not true.” (And this too is undeniable; though the argument was first used, as it appears, by Bellarmine.†) “Nor is this justifying faith, to lay hold of the righteousness and merits of Christ for the pardon of our sins; that is, to confide and trust only in that, as the meritorious cause of our pardon. For though this be part of the notion of justifying faith, it is not all; though this be one of the terms or conditions upon which we are justified, yet it is not the whole or entire condition: which, besides this, takes in an assent to the whole Gospel, repentance from dead works, and obedience to the precepts of the Gospel. And if any man can produce any one text, which saith that the faith which justifies consists only in a trust and confidence in the merits of Christ for pardon, or any thing to this effect, I will be most ready publicly to acknowledge my error: but if nobody can do this, I shall beg pardon if I continue still of the same mind as I was.”

Now here we think there is some confusion in his statement. “We are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ,” Art. xi. If this be true, the faith by which we embrace this truth is a justifying faith; in other words, no faith can justify which has not a primary regard to this part of Christian truth, a regard to the Author of our justification. It is confessed that a justifying faith includes in itself, or is inseparable from, “an assent to the whole Gospel,* repentance from dead works, and obedience to all the precepts of the Gospel.” But as our justification is not to be found in these, but in the merit of Him who died for us, our faith, as far as it justifies, must rest upon the Author of our Salvation, through whom

* Davenant, Determ. Quæst. s. 37, p. 167. “*Fatemur fiduciam non esse fidem justificantem, sed fidei justificantis filiam; ad quam anima nonnisi post multa fidei et sanctitatis exercitia solet eniti.*” Prideaux, Fasciculus Controv. c. v. s. 5, 6, p. 269, makes it a necessary consequence, but not of the essence of justifying faith.

† Bellarmin. de Eccl. iv. 21. “*Sectarii nostri temporis docent, omnem hominem justificari sola fide speciali, qua quisque credit se propter Christum coram Deo esse justum. Quod cum quolibet paradoxo comparari potest; non est enim supra, vel præter, sed contra omnem rationem. Quæro enim, quum incipio credere me esse justum, vel sum justus, vel injustus: si justus, igitur justificor per illam fidem, quæ est posterior meâ justitiâ; si injustus, illa fides est falsa; ergo non est fides justificans, nisi dicamus homines justificari per mendacium.*” See Arrowsmith, Tactica Sacra, ii. 7.

* “Non negamus, quin Dei verbum *omni ex parte* amplectantur et suscipiant fideles, &c.” Calvin. Instit. III. ii. 29.

alone we can be enabled to repent and to obey. To say then that our repentance and obedience are to be respected in the act of justifying faith, in the same way as our trust and confidence in the meritorious cause of our pardon, is a mode of speaking which does not sufficiently distinguish between the Source of Life and the path to life, or between the end and the means. The Homily of Cranmer, therefore, seems more correctly worded, where, referring to several texts in the Epistle to the Romans, he says, "St. Paul declareth nothing upon the behalf of man concerning his justification, but only a true and lively faith; which, nevertheless, is the gift of God, and not man's work without God. And yet that faith doth not exclude repentance, hope, dread, and the fear of God, to be joined with faith in every man that is justified; but it excludeth them from the act of justifying." Here we have, indeed, the concurrent doctrine of the Reformation in expounding St. Paul, as briefly expressed in that sentence of Chillingworth, "Faith alone justifies, but not that faith which is alone."

What then is the amount of Tillotson's error, if error it be? He has blended with the essence of justifying faith its inseparable concomitants, or rather, with faith in its act of justifying, things, which though they are a part of true faith, do not belong to it in that act. It is a statement logically incorrect. Not that, as the Essex ministers would charitably infer, Tillotson held the poisonous doctrine of "*meritorious conditions*;"* for his language here disclaims it; and we have not learnt to consider it a legitimate art of controversy to charge an opponent with holding consequences which he disclaims. It is, indeed, scarcely possible to take down any volume of his writings without finding many a zealous protest against the Romish doctrine of merit. And surely it was against this corrupt doctrine that the Reformers of our Church were most anxious to guard, not against modes of stating the doctrine of Justification, on which it is well known that the most eminent Reformers differed. It is not the belief of the Church of England, that this doctrine is "the fundamental doctrine of the Reformation;" she does not call it the "*articulus stantis aut cadentis Ecclesie*;" but "a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort." And wishing us to take the comfort of it rather than dispute about it, she refers us to the Homily as enlarging on this view of it, not as containing a symbolical statement of the doctrine itself. In the Article she directs our thoughts to the only merit of Christ, rather than the mode of its application. And good reason. For, it may perhaps surprise the Essex ministers

* Two Memorials, p. 41.

to be so informed, but there were advocates of the Church of Rome in the age of the Reformation, who were ready to grant justification without works, if they might have held it with their notion of merit.

“ Master Campion graunted,” says Nowell in his report of their Conference,* “ that good workes do come after the first grace, and not to be joyned with our first creation in Christ Jesus. He sayde *he would not refuse to subscribe, that we be justified by faith onely*, so that we would subscribe, that being so justified, we ought afterward to walke forward more and more in the workes of righteousness.

“ We graunted that we would so subscribe.

“ But Master Sherwin said unto M. Campion, ‘ Take heed what you do.’

“ Then sayde Master Campion, ‘ Yf you will so subscribe and graunt withal, that those *good workes are meritorious*, or do merite, I will subscribe to faith onely.’

“ Doe you now come in with your merite? sayde we, we will none of it; neyther will acknowledge any merite in respect of our justification, or of the kingdome of heaven, but only the merites of Christ’s passion. And so our subscribing was dasht by Master Campion’s addition of merite to that which before he promised without any mention thereof.”

To return to these memorials:—Having, as we have seen, made good their proof that the two old Church Societies were established with the godly design to unteach the doctrines of the Reformation, the Essex ministers proceed to show how the design was carried into effect by circulating such books as Nelson’s Festivals and Fasts, and the Whole Duty of Man. Now if historical facts entered at all into the concoction of the opinions formed at Leaden Roothing, it might have occurred to the memorialists to ask how a zealous Whig and Latitudinarian, like Bishop Burnet, and a primitive and pious Nonjuror, like Robert Nelson, were likely to have made common cause. The league between Blifil and Black George was nothing to such a coalition. But let that pass. For in the opinion of these five Presbyters, “ the whole society,” all the leading Churchmen of that period, and their children downwards to our own time,* adopted the sentiments of Tillotson, “ the fruitful source of the false doctrine which distinguishes the Society’s publications.”

We must confess that there is a fairness and freeness in this avowal, for which we ought to be thankful to the party from which it comes, as it opens very fully the extent of the mine that

* Ed. 1583, p. 27.

† Pages 8, 24, 104.

is in process of excavation under the Society. It comprises at once the destruction of the Christian character not only of Tillotson and his friends, but of Sharp and Compton, whose sufferings under James might, one should think, have cured them of all love to Popery; of Sprat and Kidder, Sherlock and Stanley, Beveridge, Gibson, Stanhope, Lucas, and Hody; Gideon Harvey, Lord Chancellor King, William Melmoth, and many eminent and pious laymen, down to the worthy Sir Richard Blackmore, who all had a hand in the foundation of the two societies. As to the succeeding generations of accessories after the fact, they cannot be numbered.

But to the proof. A great part of the Second Memorial is taken up with a critique on Nelson's Festivals and Fasts, and the Whole Duty of Man, both which, in several passages, they contrast in opposite columns with their own paraphrase of the Articles or Homilies, and especially the latter. Here we must enter our protest at the outset against such a mode of establishing charges of false doctrine. The main articles of our belief are comprised in the Church's Creeds; to which the books are not accused of adding any thing, nor have they diminished any thing from them. The simplest truths of Christian doctrine are best learnt from the Church's Catechism, and the Liturgical offices; to which the Essex ministers have in none of their criticisms referred. Now is it not confessed that the statements both of the Homilies and the Articles are in the main one-sided statements? The circumstances themselves, out of which they arose, necessarily made them such. The Puritan had not yet shown himself; the Antinomian extravagance of the seventeenth century was not even suspected. The statements were drawn with almost a single view to the Papal errors; they are generally controversial statements; and it is a most imperfect view of the reformed doctrine, which confines itself to these statements, without referring to the Liturgy.

This defect is indeed so vital, that we might safely appeal for a verdict of *Not proved*, on this ground only. But as we have no fears from allowing the trial of Robert Nelson to proceed, we will discuss the specific charges brought against him. The first passage selected for animadversion from his work is the following:—

“Q. What persons may be denominated Saints in the Church Militant?”

“A. Such who not only believe the doctrines of the Christian religion, but conform their whole lives to the precepts of it; such who not only have a holy faith, but are purified thereby, who have a sincere regard to God and another world in all their actions, and are constant and

“ uniform in the discharge of their duty ; who abstain from all kind of “ evil, perfecting holiness in the fear of God.” *

This passage the memorialists contrast with a lengthy paraphrase of their own on the seventeenth article, to which we shall hereafter refer ; and conclude by saying that Nelson’s saint, instead of being “ saved by mercy and formed by grace,” according to the doctrine of the Church, is “ saved by works, forasmuch as he is said to conform his whole life to the precepts of Christianity.” †

It is difficult to imagine how so innocent a passage could be so misunderstood ; or on what principles of reasoning such a conclusion could be formed. Nelson here says nothing of the operation by which his saint is formed : it must therefore be left for the Essex ministers to say how it was revealed to them that he is not formed by grace. They will say, perhaps, that such a saint cannot be formed on earth ; for this is the sum of four-fifths of their objection. To which we would simply answer : Did He, who taught his saints to “ be holy, as He is holy,” give them a precept which His grace would not enable them to fulfil ? Or is it the pure Gospel, for which they are so zealously affected, which bids them set limits to our Saviour’s victory over sin, and say to the power of divine grace, Thus far and no farther shalt thou go ? ‡

But Nelson’s saint was “ not formed by grace.” This may be better answered by Nelson himself : and we envy not the feelings of the men, who, after hazarding such a charge, shall read in the pages of Nelson the words of this saintly prayer :

“ O holy Father, I desire above all things to partake of thy “ righteousness ; having utterly defaced and corrupted myself, I “ would gladly be new-made by Thee ; having hitherto miscarried “ whilst I would be in my own hands, I desire now to be altogether in thine. I loath myself, O my dear God, whilst I am “ without Thee ; and whatever else I lose, my earnest prayer is, “ that I may recover thy likeness through Jesus Christ my Lord.

“ I know, O gracious Lord, that I cannot receive this but from “ thyself ; therefore be Thou the blessed Giver, and the Gift. I

* Nelson on the Festival of All Saints, p. 342, ed. 1818.

† P. 25.

‡ “ Repentance,” says our Homily, “ is a returning of the whole man to God.” What else does Nelson say ? “ We are never truly conformed to the image of the Son of God, till our old man is crucified with him, and the body of sin is destroyed. Let us therefore address ourselves to the Son of God, entreating him that he would derive into our soul the mighty efficacy of his divine and all-sufficient sacrifice, in order to accomplish that sacrifice of our old man, which can only qualify us to partake of his glory.” True Devotion, c. ix. This is the language of the man whose saint is not formed by grace !

“ know also, alas! that I am utterly unworthy to have thy divine
“ image stamped upon my soul: but I extremely need it, and I
“ extremely value it; and such Thou art pleased to account
“ worthy of it. Hear me, therefore, O my God, and breathe
“ into my heart that spirit which renews me after thine own
“ image in righteousness and true holiness. I am poor and
“ naked: O fill me with thy righteousness! My good thoughts
“ are inconstant and changeable: O fix them by thy grace! Set
“ up thy kingdom, O Jesu, in my heart; for to become thy
“ faithful servant is more to me than to have the empire of this
“ world: Keep me steadfast, O Lord, in serving Thee, till thou
“ takest me finally to enjoy Thee, through Jesus Christ, my
“ Blessed Saviour and Redeemer.”*

Let us pass to another charge:

“ Q. What obligations,” says Nelson, “ have we to the performance
“ of the duty of charity, or the love of our neighbour?

“ A. The frame of our nature disposeth us to it.”†

This Pagan sentiment is contrasted with a passage from the Homily of the Misery of Man, part ii. “ Of ourselves we be
“ crab-trees that can bring forth no apples; we be of such earth
“ as can bring forth but weeds: we have neither faith, *charity*,
“ hope, patience, chastity, nor any thing else that is good, but of
“ God; and therefore these virtues be called there the fruits of
“ the Holy Ghost, *and not the fruits of man.*” The words of the ninth Article are also added, which say that “ man is of his own nature inclined to evil.”

But how is it here inferred, that Nelson spoke of our nature in its unmitigated corruption, and not of nature informed by grace? Because he does not mention grace. Neither does he mention the corruption of nature. This proves nothing. But suppose we grant that he spoke of nature as opposed to grace, had he no warrant for what he here says at full, that we are disposed to love our neighbour by “ the frame of our nature, and
“ our inclination to society, in which there can be no pleasure, no
“ advantage, without mutual love and kindness?” Is there not one who has told us, that “ if we love them that love us, DO NOT
“ EVEN THE PUBLICANS THE SAME?” It is well said by an authority which perhaps the Essex ministers may respect,‡ that
“ grace destroys not the natural passions of the soul, but corrects
“ them only by destroying their corruption; and so they become
“ not merely not contrary to grace, but are made the subject and

* The prayer is Kettlewell's, but adopted by Nelson. On Ash Wednesday, p. 381.

† Festival of St. John Evangelist, p. 79.

‡ Leighton, Sermon viii.

“seat of grace. The passion of love, which is the chief of them, “it abolisheth not, but rectifies it, recalling it to its due object, “and turning it into the right channel.” Surely, then, a preacher of charity would lose one of his most persuasive arguments, if he neglected to point out how natural is that love which the law of God seeks only to refine. Or do the Essex ministers intend us to understand that the best capacity for the Gospel grace of charity is to be “*without natural affection?*”

The next false doctrine of which Nelson is accused is, that our charity is to gain our acceptance with God.

“Q. How is a day of fasting to be observed by serious Christians?

“A. By relieving the wants and necessities of the poor, that our humiliation and prayers may find acceptance with God.”*

A passage which is placed in contrast with the Tenth and Twelfth Articles where “good works” are said to be “the fruits of faith, “acceptable to God in Christ,” and that “we have no power to “do good works without the grace of God by Christ preventing “us.” How Nelson contradicts these Articles in this passage, it is not in our power to divine. The duty he enjoins is to be practised “by serious Christians:” if there are any answering to that character without faith, they at least did not enter into Nelson’s reckoning. For the rest, what will the Essex Council say to the teacher whom Nelson followed? Isai. lviii. 7, 9.

The next passage is not Nelson’s, but Kettlewell’s. It is taken from one of his prayers.

“Remember not against me my manifold follies, but let them all be done away by thy mercies, and my blessed Saviour’s merits, *and my own true repentance.*”†

In which, say the memorialists, using Bishop’s Hall’s words, “man is made to part stakes with Christ” in the article of his justification.‡ How so? Does not Kettlewell here beseech God to grant him true repentance? What he asks for as a gift, how can he value as a merit of his own? There is much more, however, on this same doctrine of repentance.

“Q. What are the great advantages of frequent examination?

“A. It prompts us to *repentance as the only cure* for that guilt which oppresses our minds.”§

* Preliminary on Fasting, p. 360. Compare Cyprian. De Opere et Eleemosynis, p. 199, ed. Fell. “Neque enim prometeri misericordiam Domini poterit, aut impetrabit de divina pietate aliquid in precibus, qui ad preces pauperum non fuerit humanus.”

† Easter Eve, p. 419.

‡ Page, 28.

§ All Fridays, p. 508. The singular perverseness of judgment, which could take offence at this passage, will be more conspicuous, if the reader will refer to the preceding question and answer.

The cure, but not the Physician! The very term implies a higher source from which the cure must come. Again:

"Though pardon and forgiveness of sins were procured for us by the death of Christ, yet *repentance is necessary to qualify us to receive the benefit of it.*" Ash-Wednesday, p. 374. "That is," say the Essex ministers, "unless we qualify ourselves by repentance to receive the benefit, the death of Christ does not procure pardon for us: repentance must be first in man, before the blood of Christ can avail him." p. 29.

"They are greatly deceived, that preach repentance without Christ. "They that think they have done much of themselves towards repentance are so much the more farther from God, because they do seek those things in their own works, which ought only to be sought in our Saviour Jesus Christ, and in the merits of his death, passion, and bloodshedding." Hom. of Repentance, Pt. i. p. 327.

But how does it appear that Nelson here does "preach repentance without Christ?" or thinks "he can do much of *himself* towards repentance?" Because he does not say how repentance is to be wrought in us. This is the prime fallacy of all the Essex logic, drawing an inference from negatives. Why not interpret Nelson by himself, and ask him how this qualification is to be obtained?

"Most merciful God," is this good man's prayer, "who desirest not the death of a sinner, but rather that he should turn and live, who hast graciously, in thy holy Gospel, provided for our recovery, and encouraged our repentance, by many promises of pardon and forgiveness, *fit and prepare me for this exercise of thine abundant mercy, by true sorrow and hearty contrition*, by condemning my past follies, and by stedfastly proposing entirely to forsake them for the time to come: and then, O heavenly Father, for thine own infinite mercies' sake, whose property it is to show compassion; for thy truth and promise's sake, who art faithful and just; for the merits and sufferings of the Son of thy love, in whom thou art well pleased; cleanse me from all my iniquities, receive me into thy favour, and let me continue therein all the days of my life, through Jesus Christ our Lord."*

But he teaches "that repentance must be first in man, before the blood of Christ can avail him." Is this false doctrine? Cranmer, we imagine, taught the same, when he said that "repentance is to be joined with faith in every man that is justified." Is it not in the nature of cause and effect, that conviction of sin, and repentance towards God, must precede faith in the blood of Christ? How can a man believe in a Saviour, of whom he has not yet felt the need? The truth is well stated in those words of Arminius: "Repentance comes before faith in

* St. Peter's Day, p. 288.

“ Christ; but follows that faith, whereby we believe that God is
 “ willing to receive the penitent into grace.”*

“ Q. How was St. Peter recovered from his fall ?

“ A. Endeavouring by his penitential tears to wash away his guilt.”†

This passage appears to the Essex ministers to assert that penitential tears, and not the blood of Christ, wash away guilt. The full answer begins thus:—

“ By our Saviour’s gracious look, whereby he called to mind
 “ what our Saviour had foretold. And by passionately bewail-
 “ ing his folly and the aggravations of it, endeavouring, by his pe-
 “ nitential tears, to wash away his guilt.”

Surely here is no preaching of penitence without Christ. The gracious look of his Blessed Master revived his failing faith, and caused those penitential tears to flow, by which, instrumentally, St. Peter’s guilt was washed away. Is this contrary to the doctrine of the Homilies? The Homily of Repentance, referring to Joel, ii. 12, 13, says, “ We have here a perpetual rule ap-
 “ pointed us, which ought to be observed and kept at all times,
 “ that there is *none other way* [save repentance] *whereby the*
 “ *wrath of God may be pacified and his anger assuaged.*”‡ In fact the writers of the Homilies do not scruple to say of other acts of religion besides repentance, that they wash away sin.

“ *Give alms, and behold all things are clean unto you.*§ Christ
 “ teacheth, that to be merciful and charitable in helping the poor
 “ is the means to keep the soul pure and clean in the sight of
 “ God. We are taught therefore that merciful *alms-dealing is*
 “ *profitable to purge the soul from the infection and filthy spots*
 “ *of sin* And that holy Father Cyprian taketh good occasion
 “ to exhort earnestly to the merciful work of giving alms and
 “ helping the poor, by the which we may purge our sins, and
 “ heal our wounded souls.||

“ But some one will say, If alms-giving and our charitable
 “ works towards the poor be able *to wash away sins, to reconcile*
 “ *us to God*, to deliver us from the peril of damnation, and make
 “ us the sons and heirs of God’s kingdom: then are Christ’s
 “ merits defaced, and his blood shed in vain, then are we *justified*
 “ *by works*, and by our deeds may merit heaven. Understand, dearly
 “ beloved, that neither of those places of Scripture, neither the

* “ Pœnitentia fide in Christum prior est ; posterior vero illa fide qua creditur Deum velle pœnitentem in gratiam recipere.” Arminii Articuli de Pœnitentia. Opera, p. 960.

† St. Peter’s Day, p. 281.

‡ p. 325.

§ Hom. of Alms Deeds, part ii. p. 235, 236.

|| — “ solis elemosynis Deum posse placari.” Cyprian, De Oper. &c. p. 198. This Homily is in many parts a translation from Cyprian’s Treatise.

“ doctrine of the blessed Martyr St. Cyprian, do mean that our
 “ work and charitable deed is the *original cause of our acception*
 “ before God, or that for the dignity and worthiness thereof our
 “ sins may be washed away; for that were indeed to deface
 “ Christ, and to defraud him of his glory.

“ The meaning of these sayings is, that we, doing these things
 “ according to God’s will and our duty, have our sins indeed
 “ washed away, and our offences blotted out; not for the wor-
 “ thiness of them, but by the grace of God, which worketh all in
 “ all: and that, for the promise that God hath made unto them
 “ that are obedient unto his commandment, that He which is the
 “ Truth might be justified in performing the truth due unto his
 “ true promise.”

What makes it more remarkable is, that these memorialists have quoted this Homily at some length in another part of their remonstrance.* If they would only have thought it possible that Nelson might have used an equivocal expression with as innocent a meaning, they might have saved themselves and us some unnecessary trouble. In the meantime they proceed to select, as unsound, passages which contain the most literal exposition of Scripture.

“ ‘ Q. Whence arises our obligation to repentance ?’

“ ‘ A. From the absolute necessity of it, in order to *make us capable of the mercy and forgiveness of God*: without repentance we must be unavoidably miserable; for it is the great *condition* upon which our salvation depends: and this change in our wicked tempers must be wrought *before we can be qualified* for that happiness promised in the Gospel covenant.”†

Now what is there asserted here, or in twenty other passages to the same effect, which is not virtually implied in the very title of the “ Homily of Repentance and of *true reconciliation unto God?*” What is there in the words themselves, which is not a literal exposition of those texts which bid men to “ seek good, “ and not evil, *that they may live?*” to “ repent and be converted, *that their sins may be blotted out?*” which teach us that “ they that are Christ’s *have crucified the flesh,*” and “ except we “ be converted and become as little children, we *shall not enter into* “ the kingdom of heaven?” Are we to teach that a man is “ made “ meet for that inheritance,” before he has made the conquest of one sin, or begun the practice of holiness? The memorialists would lead us to conclude so, by objecting to a question of Nelson’s, in which he says that St. Matthew “ entirely conquered “ the vice of covetousness;”‡ as if such a phrase was perfectly

* p. 88, 89.

† On Ash Wednesday, p. 377. Memorials, p. 29.

‡ St. Matthew’s Day, p. 310. Memor. p. 38.

inadmissible in speaking of one who at the first call of his Blessed Saviour left all and followed him ;

“ At once he rose and left his gold ;
His treasure and his heart transferred.”

With what faith can these censors offer up the Church's prayer on St. Matthew's Day?

Hitherto we have taken the objections as they stand ; but there is so little variety in the succeeding pages, that we must be allowed to say the answers already given will apply equally to them all. As an illustration of the manner in which these charges are got up, we will extract a short catalogue, which occurs at p. 57.

“ ‘ Q. When is our mortification an acceptable sacrifice ?’* ”

Obj. ‘ There occurs no mention of Christ in giving the sacrifice acceptance.’

‘ Q. What are the best helps to attain humility ?’†

Obj. ‘ Neither Christ nor his Spirit are mentioned as helping our infirmities.’

‘ Q. When may we said to set our affections on things above ?’‡

Obj. ‘ No mention occurs of the obvious answer suggested by the context ; when we are “ risen with Christ,” [which is no answer at all, but implied as a part of the question :] and when we are by faith enjoying that spiritual life which is hid with Christ in God.’ [See the last words of Nelson's answer.]

‘ Q. What is necessary to cure this sort of presumption ?’§ [self-confidence.]

Obj. ‘ There is no distinctive reference to the cross of Christ, &c.

‘ Q. When may a fast be counted religious ?’||

Obj. ‘ There is no distinctive reference to Christ or the Holy Spirit in the answer.’ ”

Now is it essential to a clear view of Gospel truth, that all just principles of reasoning should be discarded ? How does any one of these real or fancied omissions prove that Robert Nelson made no account of Christ or his grace in building up the virtues of a Christian life ? How can ten or twenty negatives prove a positive ? This kind of proof is so absurd, that it really borders upon the ludicrous. There is a foolish story of an angry man, but discreet withal, who told a soldier of military rank, that “ setting aside his knighthood, he would say he lied :” to which the knight quietly replied, “ he could not allow any thing to be set aside which properly belonged to him.” In the same manner, setting aside God's grace, the doctrine of Nelson lies ; but seeing there is scarcely a page in Nelson's book which does not

* On the Epiphany, p. 104.

† On Easter Sunday, p. 148, 149.

‡ Preliminary on Fasting, p. 358.

† On the Purification, p. 123.

§ St. Peter's Day, p. 287.

assert the necessity, or pray for the gift, of God's grace, we cannot allow that to be set aside which so properly belongs to it.

We now come to graver matter. It is part of Nelson's doctrine:—

“That all our religious actions are of no value in the sight of God, except they be performed with a respect to his authority, and out of obedience to his holy will; and that by designing other by-ends, as our own profit, or the praise of men, we *lose our title* to that reward which He has promised.”*

That our service should *entitle* us to reward is a phrase which the five ministers cannot tolerate; and yet it is said of those who do the commandment, that “they have a RIGHT,” in some sense, “to the tree of life.”† But if the above proposition is false, the contradictory to it must be true; viz. that *some men*, by designing other by-ends, as their own profit, or the praise of men, *do not lose their title* to reward. In fact, the Essex ministers lay this down as one of the axioms of Christianity.

“As to losing our title by false and imperfect motives, or ‘*forfeiting our title to rewards by consenting to any known iniquity*,’ as Nelson intimates;‡ as our title never stood on the perfection of our repentance, or any other work or grace, ‘for all the works we can do be imperfect,’ says the Homily; so we *can never lose our title or forfeit it*, so long as it depends on God's mercy in Christ; for ‘our justification doth come freely by the mere mercy of God,’ &c.; so that neither imperfection of motive, *nor consenting to any known iniquity*, shall be laid to our charge.”§

We doubt whether Crisp or Saltmarsh ever said any thing more Antinomian than this. Let the Essex ministers ask themselves how it agrees with the service which they read upon Ash-Wednesday. In fact the system of these five Presbyters is essentially Antinomian, as may be seen from the whole tenour of their running comment. Of a saint or true Christian as described in our Church's Articles, they say,—“The development and application of God's purpose of mercy to him as a sinner, is at once the privilege and duty of him as a saint:” which, divested of its cumbrous phraseology, seems to mean that the private persuasion of his own part in Paradise is all that he has to seek or labour for. And this is educed from the Article, which warns us, at the outset, that God's counsel is “*secret to us*,” and, at the close, that “we must receive God's promises, as they be generally set forth to us in Holy Scripture,” not substituting a private revelation of our own.

And this is called “his duty as a saint,” as if it included all his duty, “the working out of his own salvation,” meaning nothing more than his making sure of God's purpose of mercy to himself.

* St. Bartholomew, p. 303.

† See Bishop Hopkins's Sermon on this text.

‡ Forty Days of Lent.—Prayer iv. p. 370.

§ P. 36.

Let us take heed. There are indeed given unto us “ exceeding great and precious promises:” but what is the character of those who shall partake of them? Let us beware how we thus persuade ourselves of God’s favour, as if for us He would cancel the eternal difference between good and evil. For what was it but this which led to the heavy rejection of God’s chosen people? Persuaded that “ they could not by consenting to any known iniquity forfeit their title to reward,” they kept not the law of their fathers, but CONDEMNED THE INNOCENT. And how shall erring man discern his way, when he has made it a part of his belief, that he may more safely consent to any known iniquity, than suspect the certainty of his title to reward?

The Essex ministers have given us, in another part of these Memorials, their own exposition of Scriptural truth:* which, besides embodying the modern symbolical phrase of ‘ a Tri-une Jehovah,’ (a phrase which either confounds the Holy Persons, or divides the Substance,) is pervaded by the same views of personal assurance, “ *certain* evidence, and *infallible* accompaniments of God’s gracious design to save them.” They elicit from the Articles and Homilies that very doctrine, the absence of which was one of the reasons against subscription urged by the old Puritans.† Yet these are the men who press their claim to be heard as “ well conversant with the writings of our Reformers.” In the meantime, without suspecting this practically Popish doctrine of their own, they conclude their consignment of Nelson to the Expurgatory Index thus:—

“ What wonder if this Papist in spirit should hold doctrines expressly Papistical, such as—the saints praying for us, and Mary the Mother of God.”

“ Q. ‘ What communion have the saints here below with the saints above?

‘ A. They pray for us, for our consummation in bliss.’—*Nelson. All Saints’ Day*, p. 345.

—“ No man knoweth whether they do pray for us or no; and, if any will go about to prove it by the nature of charity, because they did pray for men on earth; then may it be said by the same reason, that as oft as we do weep on earth, they do also weep in heaven.”
—*Hom. on Prayer*, part ii. p. 196.

“ With respect to the passage which gives the reasons ‘ why the Blessed Virgin Mary is [styled] the Mother of God,’ and which appears in the common editions of Nelson’s work,‡ but *is expunged from the Society’s edition of 1833*, 12mo. your memorialists will no further dwell upon the subject, than to show the plain Popery, in which this confused

* Pp. 12—15.

† “ They affirme that a man, after he hath receyved the Holy Ghost, may fall from grace, [Art. xvi.] contrarie unto the *certainie* of God his election.”—*Puritan Register* (A Collection of Tracts published by the Puritans), p. 553.

‡ On the Annunciation, p. 138.

system of faith and works must necessarily terminate : to express their pleasure to find that the Society is not unaware of the erroneous nature of its publications, and is in some measure desirous to correct them ; and to avail themselves of the present occasion to press on the Society *the utter hopelessness of correcting such a work as Nelson's*. The poison of false doctrine—salvation on the meritorious condition of works,—pervades it from first to last ; and when the body is full of thorns, the removal of one or two will afford but little relief to the sufferer.”*

We have several things to say to this passage. And, first of all, we would gladly know by what precedents the Council of Leaden Roothing condemns these doctrines for Popish. As to the saints praying for us, the Homily they quote says nothing ; it merely touches on an unsound argument used to prove it ; the Homily says much *against our praying to them*. Had the objectors looked a few lines further, they would have seen that the author of the Homily had no objection to admit the supposition : “ Admit,” he says, “ that the saints do pray for us, yet we do not know how, whether specially for them that call upon them, or *generally for all men, wishing well to every man alike :*” which was probably his opinion, taken from the Augsburg Confession,† and which was evidently Nelson’s. That the saints who are delivered from the burden of the flesh do “ pray for our consummation and bliss,” is a pious opinion which many eminent Christians have held as a part of the Communion of Saints. And the interest, which the saints departed evidently feel in the warfare of their brethren on earth, makes the opinion not only pious but probable. See Rev. vi. 10, 11 ; xi. 17, 18.

Without the imputation of Popery, however, it may be supposed that they feel a more particular desire for the felicity of friends or children left below. St. Augustin, speaking of his deceased friend Nebridius, before the doctrine of the sleep of the parted soul was yet current : “ In sinu Abraham Nebridius
“ meus vivit, dulcis amicus meus, tuus autem, Domine, adopti-
“vus ex liberto filius. Ibi vivit ; nam quis alius tali animæ
“ locus ? Jam non ponit aurem ad os meum, sed spiritale os ad
“ fontem tuum, et bibit quantum potest sapientiam pro aviditate
“ sua sine fine felix. Nec sic eum inebriari arbitror ex ea, *ut*
“ *obliviscatur mei*, quum tu, Domine, quem potat ille, nostri sis
“ memor.”‡

Archbishop Bramhall, in a tract addressed to a papistical opponent, who had aimed at converting Prince Charles to the communion of his mother : “ We do not doubt but the *prayers of*

* Pp. 40, 41.

† “ In cælis orant pro ecclesia in genere,” is put as a supposition probable from Scripture. Apol. August. Confess. ix. 3.

‡ Confess. lib. ix.

“ *his father*, who now follows the Lamb in white, will be more effectual with God for his perseverance, than the prayers of his mother for his change.”*

But it may be said that these are only rhetorical passages, from which no certain doctrine can be presumed. Let us then go to our Church’s expositors of the Apostles’ Creed.

Barrow, in his interpretation of the Communion of Saints, says, “ That all the saints, those which either now converse upon earth, or *which are received into heaven*, communicate, partake, join together, consent, and agree in what concerns saints or members of the same body; in believing and acknowledging the same heavenly truth; in performance of devotions and offices of piety toward God, with and *for each other*.”

And Bishop Pearson, “ The Communion of Saints in the Church of Christ with those which are departed, is demonstrated by their communion with the saints alive. For if I have communion with a saint of God as such, while he liveth here, I must still have communion with him when he is departed hence; because *the foundation of that communion cannot be removed by death*. . . . What acts or external operations this communion produceth is not so certain. That we communicate with them in hope of that happiness which they actually enjoy, is evident; that we have the Spirit of God given us as an earnest, and so a part of their felicity, is certain. They which first found this part of the article in the Creed, and delivered their exposition unto us, have made no greater enlargement of this communion as to the saints in heaven, than the society of hope, esteem, and imitation on our side, of *desires and supplications on their side*. What is now taught by the Church of Rome, as it is an unwarrantable, so it is a novitious interpretation.”

If any one thinks the belief of this doctrine to lead necessarily to our praying to the saints, we see no such necessity. The will of the blessed inhabitants of heaven is one with the will of their Father and their God: no wish or prayer of ours, however lawful, could move them to ask acceptance for those whom God will not accept. Nor does this belief make it necessary for us to suppose that they know what is daily passing in this transitory scene, which might often interfere with their joy; consequently it is more than doubtful whether they could hear our prayers.† The error of the Romanists proceeds from their false notions of

* Victory of Truth, &c. 1654. p. 197.

† Archbishop Bramhall, in the tract above quoted, refers to the same passage of Augustin as is quoted in the Homily, “ *Fatendum est, nescire mortuos quid hic agatur*.” Victory of Truth, p. 201.

mediation, and merits of the saints, whom they make not only intercessors with Christ, but propitiators of God's favour.*

As to styling the blessed Virgin the mother of God, did the Essex ministers ever chance to hear of the Council of Ephesus, a council which *was not held in a corner*, and whose acts should be known at least to those who profess to be "well conversant with the writings of our Reformers," since our Reformers commonly appeal to them? Do they not know that the Church to which they belong, and all the sound part of the Reformation at home or abroad, respect the decrees of that council? And do they not know when and why the term Θεοτόκος was adopted, to embody a most vital truth, that the holy child born of the Virgin Mary was very God? They have no right to plead ignorance here. For they have, in their hasty injustice, referred us for "an account of the origin of this *error*,"† as they call it, to Bishop Pearson on the Creed, Art. iii. p. 177, 178. Doubtless Bishop Pearson has, in the place referred to, traced with his consummate learning the origin and progress of the name. But it is morally impossible that one of the five ministers can have read his words; how they infer that he thought the use of it an error is otherwise inexplicable. It was no part of Bishop Pearson's theological system to stigmatize as "*plain Popery*" a title adopted by the general consent of the Church of the Fathers. "We cannot," he says, "bear too reverent a regard to the " 'Mother of our Lord,' so long as we give her not that worship " which is due to the Lord himself. *Let us keep the language of " the Primitive Church. Let her be honoured and esteemed; " let Him be worshipped and adored.*"‡

Such are the charges of plain Popery, preferred by a doctor of theology, three masters of arts, and one bachelor,—the one against a pious opinion, which Scripture renders probable, which the expositors of the Church's faith have sanctioned, and which no Reformed or other Church has ventured to condemn; the other against a venerable title, which Scripture authorizes, and the Church receives:—

"Mussat tacito Doctrina timore!"

There remains, however, a subject of deeper regret, an evil of far greater magnitude than the false chronology, false logic, and false divinity, of five country pastors, who have thus combined to stultify themselves. *By what authority has the work of Robert Nelson been subjected to the mutilation*, over which these zealous gentlemen sing their sabbath-notes, and antedate its doom? Whose is the rash hand that has inflicted so deep a maim? We trust that

* See Apol. August. Confess. ix. 5, 7.

† See their note, p. 41.

‡ See also Barrow, Sermon, xxiv. on the Creed.

all the primitive-spirited members of the Society will make their strong remonstrance, that this *cutting and clipping* of the remains of the honoured dead may be once for all forbidden,—that such passages, as we have just been considering, in which nothing but ignorance or malice could find offence, *may be immediately restored*. As to this work of Nelson, the Church of England has reason to regard it as a public work; the best companion to the services of her sanctuary, the most popular connecting link between her and the primitive Church of Christ, the most devotional in its spirit, and simply intelligible and practical in its details, that any son of hers has produced. And as such it has been well approved. With the first settlers in the East, and to the farthest colonies of the West it has gone forth,* wherever two or three have gathered together in obedience to the law of their Mother or their native land, solacing the labours of the missionary, or simple piety of the peasant, with such thoughts as hallow a communion-day. Alteration or diminution must debase the character and tone of thought in such a mind as his. And how unjust is it to his memory,—how discreditable to the Society itself, after more than one hundred and twenty years, to fix this note of heresy on the name of its earliest benefactor!† Surely, the success of this attempt to propitiate envy, as displayed in the Essex Memorials, will have some weight; the sight of *the limb lopped off* from the bleeding victim only animates the cry of *war to the knife* against his precarious existence! But we would appeal to better feelings and a sounder view of duty. Think, we would say, what benefit the Society has derived from the association of the name of Nelson with its own. Think how this work especially has become almost the property of the Society; how your editions are purchased, in faith on the part of the public, for the genuine record of his thoughts whose name they bear. Is it honest in the eyes of the world,—is it true to the trust you have received,—is it fair to the good name of the departed saint; to pare down or melt away the sterling ore of his writings, to send them out in a new shape? Even if you could question some statements in his doctrine, as not approvable to your judgment, is not something due to the character of the man? Is it not some praise to the Church in which he was reared, to have produced a man, who, with all the attractions of wealth and accomplished manners and personal grace, uninfluenced by disappointment or change of circumstance, renounced the world without a sigh, freely chose the better part,

* See the nervous lines of the elder Wesley, prefixed to the old editions of the True Devotion :—

“Thy name the tawny Malabar has known;
Across the great Atlantic Gulf 'tis flown, &c.”

† The first name in the list of benefactors is, “1713. Robert Nelson, Esq., 100l.

and humbly strove to adorn and make known the doctrine of his God and Saviour? And should not any committee, however competent, however respectable for Christian character, question their own impressions in judging of the long-approved words and thoughts of a mind like his? The spirit which dictated that book might well implore:—

“ Be kind to my *remains*; and oh defend,
Against your judgment, your *departed friend*;
Let not the insulting foe my fame pursue,
But shade those honours, which descend to you.”

We have now done with the case of Nelson. *Let the wrong which has been done him be redressed.* The Whole Duty of Man falls next under the censure of the Essex ministers; and especially for representing the terms of the Gospel-covenant according to the language of the Baptismal Vow.* But our readers, who have seen the kind of criticism, to which the work of Nelson has been subjected, will readily excuse us from entering into further detail. In the name of common honesty and common sense, we entreat, that those who are entrusted with the management of the Society's affairs will give no more encouragement to this more than civil war, in which Churchmen are turning their arms against their friends, and rending the bowels and spilling the life-blood of their mother. If these books were, indeed, what these intestine adversaries make them out, it would be too late to make that discovery now; the sanction of such names as have approved them good can never be done away, while the place of the Church of England remains. But this excellent book, the sound corrective of that Antinomian frenzy, to which we pray that neither the Church of Christ nor the social system of England may ever be exposed again, has besides a further recommendation in the Christian humility and retired benevolence of its unknown author. It is known that the author was the friend of Hammond; but who, or even of what sex this true yoke-fellow in the bonds of the Gospel was, is yet unknown. Never was there an instance of so many anonymous writings published with a design so pure. Never was there shown such abundant labour of love from a person whose name was so studiously concealed.†

The second memorial speaks of other books and tracts which have undergone the same process of the melting-pot.‡ We, in our simplicity, were really ignorant of this; except in the case of

* Pages 46, 47.

† Instead of weakly defending the Whole Duty of Man, the Society would consult best for the object of its institution by adding other productions of the same pen to its list, especially the beautiful Art of Contentment, and the Christian's Birthright.

‡ See p. 81.

Melmoth, for whom an appeal was made at the time, not, as we hoped, in vain. But if these gentlemen state facts, one thing is quite clear: that it is the duty of any member who values the integrity of the Society's character, to demand, at one of the earliest meetings, *that an account of all the alterations, made in the new editions of previously authorized and standard books, be laid before the General Meeting, and printed for the information of the Society at large.* We have been duly informed, that, at the Monthly Meeting in March, 1836, the Tract Committee "declined that part of the office" which seems to have been assigned them, "of correcting passages deemed open to objection in works already on the Society's Catalogue."* Now, as the word "decline," simply understood, has reference to the past as well as to the future, and as we conclude what was found impracticable upon the whole, has not, on principle, been retained in part, we may presume that the gentlemen composing that body have altogether extricated themselves from the false position they had inadvertently occupied. By whom then have these alterations been made? The Report to which we have referred goes on to say, that "*the duty of making corrections in the old books and tracts has reverted to the Standing Committee.*" The *duty* of correcting Robert Nelson or Jeremy Taylor! And *reverted!* How was it first given? Plainly not by virtue of any Rule or Order of the Society. And if any act of a monthly meeting conveyed to them such extraordinary powers, the proceeding was palpably irregular, without a previous alteration of the Rules and Orders. We must request that further attention may be called to the subject; and that those steps, which from the first were essentially unconstitutional, may be entirely retraced.

In conclusion we would, with all the humility which becomes fallible and infirm men, yet with all the earnestness which is required of lovers of truth and peace, intreat the members of this Society, and of the Church at large, to inquire diligently into the real causes of the dangers which we see and feel. Is it merely a perplexed theory on the mode of applying the Scriptural truth which we all cherish, which has given a new impulse to the genius of Popery,—or is it that "because iniquity abounds, the love of many has waxed cold?" Are not those preachers in court favour, who teach that all opinions are indifferent,—that the adoration of a sacred wafer, for instance, may be as laudable an act of service, as the worship of our Lord in heaven,—or, that whether we believe the soul mortal or immortal, the moral sense may remain unchanged? Has not the common saw of philosophical Paganism become the received creed of a large proportion

* Society's Report for 1836, p. 18.

of our public men, that the God of Truth looks upon the different religions of the Bible, the Koran, or Confucius, with as much complacency as upon the different climates and productions of the soil? Are there not those who would consecrate the ardour of sensual passion as issuing from the fount of grace, and make the language of the fond, and frail, and miserable, a part of the dictate of "the royal law?"* And in such a state of things, can it be wondered at, if the most corrupted forms of Christianity are those which find acceptance most,—if the Socinian and Papist make common cause, the one making it his principle to have no fixed belief, the other released from all personal concern in a matter in which he has not to answer for himself? Let us turn our thoughts to means by which the current of unbelief may yet be stemmed; let us think of our fathers in evil days, let us learn to steel our souls against the enticements of ease and luxury, and stand upon our watch while the powers of darkness are abroad!

And as to the Essex ministers, we would commend to their devout thoughts the *too prophetic* words of the good man whose memory they have traduced,

"It must be owned," says Nelson, "that Bishop Bull was
"indeed a very frank assertor of some primitive truths, upon
"which are built several errors of the Church of Rome: and
"*among those who cannot or will not distinguish the foundation*
"from the hay and stubble that is built upon it, we must not
"wonder if he was thought too much inclining to the Church of
"Rome. But this calumny hath been thrown upon the greatest
"lights of our Church, and upon one of the best men that ever
"swayed the sceptre of Great Britain; and will be the fate of
"many more, who shall zealously contend for the primitive doc-
"trines and discipline of Christianity. And surely, if that excel-
"lent prince King Charles the First, and that primitive prelate
"Archbishop Laud, could not escape the load of such malicious
"and groundless imputations, it is not to be wondered if others
"who pursue their steps, and tread in their paths of religion,
"though they move in an inferior sphere, meet with the same
"obloquy and reproach, which they so severely felt. BUT YET,
"IN THE DAY OF ANY TRIAL, THE MEN OF THIS CHARACTER
"WILL BE FOUND THE BEST DEFENDERS OF THE CHURCH OF
"ENGLAND, AND THE BOLDEST CHAMPIONS AGAINST THE
"CORRUPTIONS OF THE CHURCH OF ROME."†

* — "the love-tale in the sacred porch
Infected Sion's daughters.

† Nelson's Life of Bull, p. 364.

ART. VII.—*Patience and Confidence the Strength of the Church : a Sermon preached on the Fifth of November, before the University of Oxford, at St. Mary's, and now published at the wish of many of its Members.* By the Rev. E. B. PUSEY, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, Canon of Christ Church, and late Fellow of Oriel College.—Oxford: Parker. London: Rivingtons. 1837.

AMONG the various errors which distinguish and characterize the present day, there is none more common, there are few more dangerous or delusive, than an inconsistency with self, a fear of carrying out principles to their full and legitimate extent, from apprehension of popular derision or dread of popular indignation. For example,—the very men who denounce most justly the foul murder of King Charles the Martyr, and who repudiate the doctrine so familiar in the mouths of republicans and levellers, that “sovereigns may be cashiered for misconduct;” nay, who would tell you, that they do not recognize the sentiment that “the people are the source of all legitimate power;” shrink from speaking in terms of reprobation of the second rebellion, which, in 1688, drove a monarch from the throne of his ancestors; or, if pressed to the utmost, profess to regret the necessity of such a movement, admitting at the same time its expediency, and contenting themselves with a vain and empty protest against its being drawn into a precedent; utterly and too often wilfully oblivious of the fact, that the reasons which are employed and adduced to justify that, which in our blindness we style a “glorious revolution,” may be brought forward and alleged to defend, or at any rate excuse, every outrage, every atrocity to which seditious or discontented subjects have had recourse to redress real or fancied—for the principle is the same—oppression or wrongs. Men, in many respects amiable and well intentioned, go to Church, hear and join in the words of our beautiful Litany, which prays for our deliverance from “rebellion,” or make supplications in the Communion service for their Queen,—that, “duly considering whose authority she hath,” they “may faithfully serve, honour, and humbly obey her,” in and for God, according to His blessed word and ordinance; and then they leave the consecrated place of divine worship; the words, if they have ever made any impression in their plain, due and obvious sense, slip from their hearts, the maxims of mere politicians, the fashionable sentiments of the hour, occupy their thoughts; and they reject as annulled, or disregard as obsolete, the mighty and great truths which their blessed forefathers cherished dearer than their life's blood, maintaining them during an

earthly pilgrimage, often hard and always laborious, and sealing them at the close of such pilgrimage with a martyr's confession, at the block, the gibbet, or the stake. In what manner, then, and by what means were principles of the highest value and consummate importance to be again fully and entirely developed? How was the mind,—we will not say the public mind,—but the mind of persons anxious for information, however deluded and confused by the prevailing opinions of the hour, to be disabused of its errors, and restored to a healthy and consistent tone of thinking, feeling, and acting?—Not by the contemporary daily press; even the best disposed and honestest portion of the public journals is influenced by the general impressions which pervade the great mass of its readers, and is swayed by an apprehension of losing its hold upon the popular mind. To that source of instruction we must, for the present at any rate, look in vain; ephemeral publications indeed derive their tone from the sentiments of the day, reflecting them in a more systematic and tangible form, but rarely, if ever, originating new theories, or hazarding the revival of doctrines and precepts overlooked, if not entirely forgotten, by those who content themselves with a rapid and cursory glance at the mere surface; overlooked, in a word, by the vast majority of persons who pretend or profess to read or think at all. But might we look to the legislature for this much to be desired developement? To the Lower House of Parliament, compounded of the most heterogeneous materials, papist and sectarian blended together in most extraordinary confusion, to that House where the utterance of a serious sentiment but too often produces the loud laugh, or the sarcastic sneer, where even truth itself but too commonly speaks in whispers, instead of proclaiming herself trumpet-tongued through its halls, vainly, indeed, might we look even for a partial developement of these great principles; while in the Upper House, adorned though it be with the appearance of the spiritual Peers, and in no trifling degree benefited and controlled by their counsel and presence, there is but too often a low and worldly view of the great matters submitted for deliberation; too much anxiety to learn and know what people will think, in the place of a firm, decided, and steady determination to act solely upon the immutable principles of right, without reference to the temporary and fleeting results of such determination; nor again is it to the saloon or banqueting hall we dare look for the developement of great principles, occupied as are the pleasure-seeking tenants of the abodes of gaiety with reflections,—if reflections we may venture to call them,—upon the most agreeable mode of spending the transient hour, or providing for its immediate successor; not there indeed will the home of sound truth be sought, or if sought,

will it be found :—music, revelry, and the dance consist not with deep, and painful, and anxious thoughts and reflections; their home is to be sought in a more serious, a more solemn resting place, an abode where worldly vanities have neither part nor portion,—and where is that place to seek ?—The consecrated House of God : there where the taunt and gibe must at least be silenced and hushed, there where the voice of the preacher, of him who has received from the mitred descendant of the blessed Apostles his sacred and holy commission to teach and proclaim the Word of unerring Truth, there may mighty, and vast, and holy principles be proclaimed and expounded ; laying, by the blessing of Providence, a foundation, whose superstructure may surpass and exceed man's thoughts and imaginings. And if in the House of God, where more becomingly or more fitly than in that University, within whose boundaries a Ridley kindled, with the fire that consumed his earthly body, a flame which now burns with a pure and steady light,—in that church within whose walls a Cranmer confessed with his latest breath the confession of a good martyr and soldier,—on that day when, unaided and unassisted by man's miserable and imperfect devices, Divine Providence discovered and discomfited the fearful conspiracy which the head and hand of Popery had imagined and well nigh perfected, and rescued from impending and apparently inevitable destruction our blessed Church and our anointed king.—Within then such boundaries, within moreover such walls, and on such a day, the Reverend Professor of that sacred language in which Moses taught and Isaiah prophesied, preached to a congregation distinguished alike for quantity and quality the excellent discourse, to a consideration of which, with a view to its future diligent and careful perusal and study, we now earnestly invite the attention of our readers.

Dr. Pusey's sermon is inscribed to Mr. Keble, in a dedication full of truth and feeling ; and worthy indeed is that highly gifted and distinguished man of the homage so kindly and becomingly tendered : the dedication is followed by a most discreet preface, in which the *à priori* objections (if we may so term them) to the doctrines taught and contained in the sermon are encountered and refuted, not simply by argument, but by references to the opinions of doctors and confessors now, as we trust, asleep in the Lord, and to the canons of our Church as agreed upon in convocation. From that preface we cannot make an extract, its completeness requires an entire perusal. The text from which the sermon is preached is taken from Exodus, xiv. verse 13, "Fear ye not, stand still and see the salvation of the Lord, which he will show to you to-day," introducing us to a beautiful summary of the scheme and scope of the Old Testament history, the lessons to be deduced, and the

shoals and quicksands to be avoided, reprehending charitably, but decidedly, the miserable error of the day, which attempts to reduce things divine to the nature of things human, instead of endeavouring to elevate man's thoughts from earth to heaven, proceeding in its course to exhibit the wonderful analogy between the condition of the Jewish and Christian Churches, affording thereby an admirable ground-work for the observations which the day more immediately and directly elicited. We must make an extract from this portion of the discourse.

"The light then of all history is God's guidance, dim indeed often, and overlaid by the intricacy of human policy and craftiness, yet still visible to those who, in the detail of the workmanship, forget not the Maker, nor allow themselves by the study of the visible creature to be held down from beholding the Invisible. Even in heathen empires He declares by his prophets, that '*He changeth the times and seasons: He removeth kings, and setteth up kings.*'*" Even there, among those who seem to rule, He is the one Ruler. '*The Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men,*'—(an unseen power *within* man's visible kingdom, permitting or withholding, uniting or dissolving, giving strength or bringing age upon them, and directing man's free agency, like the wild uproar of the sea, to his own ends, unseen by man His work, but ever present with and *within* His work,) '*the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men and giveth it to whomsoever he will.*'† Pharaoh, Cyrus, the Assyrian, the rod of his anger,‡ but '*who meant not so, neither did his heart think so,*'§ Nebuchadnezzar, of whom God saith by Jeremiah '*I who made the earth, the man and the beast upon the ground,—and have given it unto whom it seemed good unto me, and now have I given all these lands into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon, my servant,—and all nations shall serve him, and his son, and his son's son, until the very time of his land come, and then many nations and great kings shall serve themselves of him.*'||—These are but so many specimens, and instances of His universal empire, doing all that is good, and ordering what is evil, so '*that the wrath of man doth but praise Him.*'" **—p. 4.

A beautiful passage, commenting immediately upon the words of the text, but too long for quotation, carries us through the career of several of the servants of the Lord, who adorn the history of the Old Testament, showing, for our warning, wherein they failed, who trusted to their own fancied strength, either to a less extent, like Abraham and Moses, or, in a greater degree, like Jeroboam the son of Nebat, "*who made Israel to sin;*" or exhibiting for our instruction the triumph of the Saints who relied upon the assistance of Providence for succour and support, bearing and forbearing for His name's sake; and we are thence conducted to the saints and martyrs of our own Church, exhibited

* Dan. ii. 21.

§ Isaiah, x. ver. 7.

† Ibid. iv. 25.

|| Jeremiah, xxvii. 5—7.

‡ Isaiah, x. 5.

** Psalm lxxvi. 10.

in all the beauty, dignity, and loveliness of passive obedience and non-resistance, with a power of expression of which the diligent consideration of the passage itself can alone give any thing like an adequate conception; to transcribe, indeed, a portion would violate the completeness and unity of the whole. The preacher then proceeds to declare, that “it is for instruction only that we
 “ may ask, why God should so have annexed the blessing of con-
 “ quest to enduring suffering, and made patience mightier than
 “ what men call active virtues.”—p. 23. And various probable grounds for such annexation are assigned, the humility and reverential awe of the professor restraining him in two of the reasons adduced from stating them absolutely and unqualifiedly. Of these the former is, that “it may be that they have some mysterious
 “ connection with the sufferings of Christ, which pass our under-
 “ standing.”—p. 23. And the latter, that “it may be needful, in
 “ the wisdom of God for the perfecting of His saints.”—p. 24. In a striking succession of passages, Dr. Pusey proceeds to exhibit further grounds for the intentions of the Most High in this particular: that “it is evident that so God’s power and
 “ glory is most shown.”—*ibid.* and this is traced in a passage of great beauty. Again, that “since man’s self-will was the cause
 “ of his fall, when he would be wiser than God, and in his own
 “ way be as God, God would thus teach him to submit his own
 “ will, to renounce dependence upon himself, to quit his own
 “ wisdom and his own schemes, let every thing, if needs be, go
 “ out of course, and then, ‘when the earth is weak and the inha-
 “ ‘ biters thereof,’ it will appear that the Lord ‘beareth up the
 “ ‘ pillars of it, and will say to the ungodly, Lift not up your horn,
 “ ‘ for God is the judge; He putteth down one, and setteth up
 “ ‘ another.’”^{*}—p. 26. The last reason put forth by the preacher is, that “there is room to fear lest, mingling in human schemes
 “ for her own security, the Church should leave her dependence
 “ upon God, and adopt insensibly the maxims of the world.”—*ibid.* We regret that our limits will not allow us to quote the remainder of this passage,—to present to our readers the able exposure of the errors consequent upon this departure from, and neglect of, the example and precepts of God’s holy word, which have pervaded, and still pervade, the unfortunate Church of Rome, and the misguided followers of Calvin;—but we trust our readers will diligently and carefully consider the passages to which we refer. We cannot, however, refrain from presenting the passage which has reference to our own Church; it is the concluding portion of this division of the sermon.

"It is not, God knoweth, in any spirit of boast against those branches, some of which were grafted in before us, but still in encouragement and warning, that I would notice, that herein also our Church followed the principles of the Church Catholic, and with her had her portion. She alone of all the Reformed Churches was purified in the fire, and purged by the blood of martyrs, and had the evidence of affliction that she was a beloved child and no bastard. And her general conduct has been true to her first principles, to render to Cæsar the things that were Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's; to do nothing against the command of God, but to suffer every thing which the Cæsar may require. It was thus that the seven bishops mainly checked James's tyranny, refusing to do, but submitting to suffer, what was unlawful; it was thus that even in the Great Rebellion men cheerfully took the spoiling of their goods; it was thus that, in events familiar to us, the members of this place,* at different periods, suffered what was unlawful, rather than compromise their principles;—and we cherish their memories."—p. 30.

The reverend preacher then proceeds to consider more particularly "the two events for which" the Fifth of November is observed "as an annual thanksgiving to God," and remarks that, "together," they "strikingly illustrate these principles. 1. That we may safely leave things to God; 2. That there is great risk that man, by any impatience of his, will mar the blessing which God designs for his Church."—p. 31.

A sketch by a master's hand is then drawn of the progress and result of the Popish plot in England, and of the massacre of St. Bartholomew in France, mention being also made of the fearful atrocities committed in Ireland in 1641. We cannot make any extracts, the various portions of the description are so beautifully linked together, but we may remark that the different courses adopted in the three particulars strikingly enforce the words of the text, and confirm the words of the preacher, "That the history of the Old Testament is the Sun of all other history, Christian or profane." And we are led hence to the consideration of the second event for which the day in question is kept. "The arrival on" that "day of him who became William III." We regret we cannot give selections from this portion of the discourse, its very excellence and perfectness are obstacles in the extracting portion of the reviewer's path, but the lessons drawn from the second rebellion are fraught with the soundest and holiest instruction. The wretched paltering, which induces men to speak of the "glorious revolution," as if, forsooth, rebellion in any shape could ever be glorious, is exposed and refuted; while the touching and reverential allusion to the names of Ken and his illustrious compeers, and of the venerable Hough, awaken our liveliest sympathies, and arouse our best feelings. Things are called and styled by their right

* In the times of the Great Rebellion and under James II.

names, the words of unanswerable truth shame and confute the miserable sophistry which loves to gloze over error and falsehood, and prefers consulting man's ignorance and self-will, to advancing doctrines which tend, by God's blessing, to make us truly wise. It is then well nigh impossible to exaggerate or over-estimate the solid and substantial advantages which must result from such a mode of treating such a subject;—but we must proceed in our review:—The conduct of our blessed Church, the practice of the early Church, the language of Holy Scripture, “which that Church well understood,” are contrasted with the precepts and lessons of those who justify and even glory in the second rebellion: and in a strain of holy eloquence, which demands strict and devout attention, the Reverend Professor proceeds thence to draw and deduce lessons, which, in these our days, are of vast and incalculable value and importance; we regret we cannot find room for them, but we may present our readers with the concluding passage of the sermon, which is one of peculiar profit and of extensive practical application.

“In brief, then, we may not be over-anxious even about Holy things, such as the deliverance of the Church from unjust thralldom or from spiritual disadvantages. God allowed His chosen people to lie in bondage 400 years, and not till the set time was come did he judge that power which enthralled them; and when afterwards He delivered them for their sins to Nebuchadnezzar, ‘they were to seek the peace of the city whither He had caused them to be carried captive, and after seventy years to be visited.’* They ‘stood still’ till Cyrus came, they invited him not, helped him not, but he acknowledged that ‘their God, the King of heaven had given him all the kingdoms of the earth, and given him in charge to build His temple at Jerusalem.’† God is visibly working, and preparing the army, which ‘shall be willing in the day of his power;’‡ But it is His day, His army, His power, and He must ‘give the word.’§ As of old the feet of the image were crumbling, the world was growing old, institutions were dissolving, but the people of God might not put a finger thereto, but ‘a stone cut out of the mountain *without hands* smote it and brake it in pieces;’ so must it be now whether it please God to breathe fresh life into the old institutions of the world, or whether ‘He take away his breath and they return to their dust,’ it must be His doing, not man's; what God doth, that is well done; we might mingle ‘hay, straw, and stubble’ with his work, which in the day of trial will not abide. ‘O tarry thou the Lord's leisure, be strong, and He shall comfort thy heart.’|| ‘Though it tarry, wait for it; because it will surely come, it will not tarry.’¶ O Lord God of hosts, blessed is the man that putteth his trust in thee!’”**—p. 56.

Thus then concludes this noble combination of piety, elo-

* Jeremiah, xxix. 7, 10. † Ezra, i. 2. ‡ Ps. cx. 3. § Ps. lxxviii. 11.
 || Ps. xxvii. 16. ¶ Hab. ii. 3. ** Ps. lxxxiv, 13.

quence, and learning; of which no line, no word, is without its corresponding counsel and instruction.—Our review of this admirable sermon has been necessarily brief and imperfect; if however we have succeeded in inviting the attention of one person, who has not hitherto met with it, to a diligent perusal, our labour will not have been in vain: We are indeed painfully aware that its doctrines and precepts are hard to be understood and received by the men of this day: their minds are attuned and adapted to different themes.—The rationalism of the passing hour abhors mysteries, however beautiful or sublime.—The rail-roadism (if we may be permitted the expression) of the nineteenth century repudiates that teaching which tends to crush and subdue men's pride, vanity, and conceit:—it loves to be told that human nature is all wise, all excellent, that to master the difficulties of science is man's noblest work, that utility should be the object of its vows and aspirations.

Now all these things are vastly agreeable to earthly self-esteem, and they are greedily and gladly adopted as the rules and maxims of men's instruction and conduct:—but obedience,—unlimited, unqualified obedience,—patience,—forbearing all-enduring patience, are rejected and disregarded, as things adapted to and fitted for the capacities of babes, but utterly unworthy of and unsuited to their intellectual and scientific progress and advancement,—nay, they would fain stigmatize them as novelties, simply and merely because they have never heard of them. They have not been taught that rebellion is a foul and horrible sin, and therefore the attempt to enforce and inculcate a due sense of its grievousness and enormity is an innovation;—an innovation upon their sense of right and wrong, their moral perceptions, their intellectual powers:—but the Bible,—Catholic antiquity,—the very writings of our own reformers, speak in plain language. David, the Crown Prince of Israel,—slew the Amalekite, who accused himself of having slain the Lord's anointed,—his royal predecessor Saul.—The Jews were enjoined the strictest obedience to Nabuchodnosor, under circumstances which need not now be dwelled upon.—The blessed Apostle St. Paul writes to the Roman converts, and bids them obey, for conscience sake, one of the worst princes whom Providence has, for wise and inscrutable purposes, appointed to rule over nations. The same Apostle treats with reverence the high priest who insulted and upbraided him, because he (the high priest) was the ruler of God's people.—St. Peter blends in the same sentence the exhortation to “fear God and honour the King.”—The blessed martyrs resisted not when resistance was in their power, but suffered without a murmur:—Our own homilies, our liturgy, the practice of our reformers are all suited to and framed after such

great and bright precedents, and shall we pretend to be wiser than these glorious examples?—Rome and Geneva have indeed grievously despised those blessed lessons; papal Rome taught the atrocious lesson (and if her claim of immutability be maintained must still teach it,)—that subjects were absolved from their allegiance to princes deposed or excommunicated by the Bishop of Rome, nay she even justifies their murder:—Protestant Geneva incurred the same guilt, when her miserable disciples first rebelled against, and then slew our royal martyr King Charles the First; and we will ask the advocates and champions of the (miscalled “glorious”) revolution of 1688—To what might they have been driven, had not James the Second departed from this kingdom?—Great indeed were the mercies of the King of kings!—Our course at any rate is plain, our way straight. To refuse to perform unlawful acts, but never to resist the powers which enjoin or command their performance:—thus it was that Sancroft, Ken, and Hough felt, thought and acted, and thus it is that men among us are, as we trust, by God’s blessing, prepared to act, should the Gallios of the day, whether they call themselves conservatives, or whether they are styled liberals, consent to, or enforce what Scripture, antiquity and the Catholic Church in England deprecate and forbid.—Let men write and speak evil of us, let party reproach, or faction upbraid us; we must bear and forbear: action is far more easy than endurance, the laurel wreath is less difficult of achievement than the crown of martyrdom.—Our part must be taken, our portion chosen with suffering and obedience, if we would wish or desire to seek His glory, to obey His word.—The result,—whatever may be our temporal position, our earthly lot,—is briefly but emphatically told in the beautiful words of the text, already quoted, but to be repeated and rehearsed, until graven in our memory of memories, our heart of hearts:—“Fear ye not, stand still, and see the salvation of the Lord which he will show to you to day.”

ART. VIII.—*The History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, comprising the Civil History of the Province of Ulster, from the Accession of James the First; with a Preliminary Sketch of the Progress of the Reformed Religion in Ireland during the Sixteenth Century, and an Appendix, consisting of Original Papers.* By James Seaton Reid, D. D., Minister of the Presbyterian Church, Carrickfergus, Vols. I. and II. London, Whittaker & Co. 1836.

AN ecclesiastical history of Ireland, founded on enlarged principles and written with learning and temper, is still much wanted, and would fill up an important space in our national annals. The imperfect notices and biographical fables which alone, prior to the tenth century, constitute our only means of information relative to the constitution, and more especially the doctrine and ritual of the Church in the Hibernian provinces, can no longer be held sufficient to meet the views of an inquisitive reader. It may be doubtful, indeed, whether Ireland itself has retained any authentic records of her more primitive times, entitled to a greater degree of credit than the traditions of her monasteries, and the lives of her saints; but there may be in the repositories of the Vatican, some registers or other deeds which might serve to throw light on the opinions and condition of the clergy, before the days of Henry II. The object contemplated by Dr. Reid does not comprehend such investigations. Presbyterianism, considered as the form of a Christian society, is a thing comparatively recent; for though the author, by means of spectacles, borrowed from sectarian writers, can discover among certain ancient monks the predominance of presbyterian principles, and, in the kingdom at large, a polity which assigned to bishops the charge of only one parish, we are, nevertheless, compelled to class his powers of vision with such as perceive most in the dark, and hence confound things that are not with those that are.

We are indebted to Archbishop Usher for the best account that has come down to us of the “Religion professed by the ancient Irish.” It may, indeed, be admitted that the position which he occupied with respect to the Romanists, and the controversial spirit of the times in which he lived, from the influence of which the most vigorous minds were not altogether free, have in some places affected the bearing of his argument, or, at all events, determined the selection of his authorities. But Usher was too sincere in his love of truth to allow himself to deviate from the duties of an historian, or to sink the high character of the divine in the paltry triumph of the disputant. He calls our attention to the remark of St. Chrysos-

tom, who said "although thou wert to go to the ocean, and to the remote British isles, although thou wert to sail to the Euxine sea, or to the farthest regions of the south, yet shouldest thou hear all men reasoning on the Scriptures, in different languages indeed, but with one belief, in a variety of dialects, but with the same judgment." Bede also boasted that, in his own days, the inhabitants of Britain, in five several tongues, did search into the elements of eternal truth, and the most exalted philosophy, confessing the same faith though with a diversified utterance. The languages here mentioned belonged to the Angles, the Britons, the Scots, the Picts, and the Latins. "For as by us now, so by our forefathers then," says the archbishop, "the continual meditation of the Scriptures was held to give special vigour and vegetation to the soul; and the holy sentiments delivered therein were esteemed by Christians as their chief riches."

"Sint tibi divitiæ, divinæ dogmata legis."

Perhaps, in some instances, the patriotic zeal of the learned metropolitan may have led him to confound the rhetorical flourishes of an ancient father with such literal statements as might be embodied in a modern census. Hence his inference, that the Irish, in the fifth and sixth centuries, had a care, from their very childhood, to learn the Holy Scriptures, and that in those days it was not thought a thing unfit that even children should give themselves unto the study of the Bible, cannot be rendered quite consistent with the fact, that the version of the sacred writings then commonly used was in Latin. But it is, at the same time, perfectly manifest, that the study of theology was much encouraged among the learned, and also that the more recondite investigations of Biblical criticism had attained a considerable degree of perfection. The commentaries of Sedulius would do honour to an improved age; while the piety of Bishop Aidan affords the most pleasing kind of evidence that the doctrines of Christianity were not studied in vain by members of the Church.

There prevails among all presbyterian writers the singular but very groundless fancy, that the polity of the Christian commonwealth in those early days was anti-episcopal. An observation by Bede, not well understood, has been employed, in a variety of controversial works, with the view of proving that the highest order of clergymen was either not recognized among the Irish and Scots, or deprived of the authority which usually attaches to their function. It is maintained that these people, in old times, differed exceedingly from the Roman church, in doctrine, discipline, and church government; that before the middle of the tenth century they had no bishops, but that their church was governed

by presbyters, and religious monks called Culdees, who were no friends to bishops, and kept themselves pure from all innovations and corruptions of the church of Rome, and were at perpetual variance with the Romish clergy. From these premises it is made to follow, that the supposed successors of those men, "have the sole right to possess all churches, church-lands, and benefices, because they are the restorers of the Christian religion as anciently professed in this kingdom, for that bishops are only intruders amongst us, innovators, and schismatics; on which account they were justly pillaged and set aside at the time of the Reformation, and deposed at the beginning of the Grand Rebellion."

The Scots, mentioned in all chronicles and deeds prior to the tenth century, were unquestionably natives of the Greater Scotia or Ireland; for which reason Dr. Reid is justly entitled to apply all conclusions respecting their ancient church to the history of his own country. The celebrated Culdees of Iona are acknowledged by every author, competent to form an opinion on the subject, to have been monks of Hibernian extraction; and hence it may be plausibly inferred, that whatever were their notions on ecclesiastical polity, similar opinions must have prevailed in the land whence they migrated. It may be premised, however, that from all we know concerning the doctrines and usages of the followers of Columba, no fair inference can be drawn which will bear with any perceptible weight on the question of church government. Every reader is aware, that Blondell, Selden, Baxter, and other non-conformists, in both divisions of the kingdom, imagined that they could discover in the scheme of administration said to have been adopted by the Abbot of Iona, a warrant, or at least some degree of countenance, for the system of ecclesiastical rule to which themselves were attached. On the other hand, Usher, Stillingfleet, and Lloyd, bishop of Worcester, endeavoured, in their several works, to expose the futility of conclusions founded neither on established facts nor authentic records, but on the fictions of authors the earliest of whom did not exist till more than a thousand years after the period to which the most important part of his narrative refers. No one of them, in short, appears to have had any groundwork for his details except the uncertain traditions of his age, and no check on his statements beyond the dreams of his credulous contemporaries.

It is hardly necessary to remark, that the term Culdee was applied generally to the order of religious men who, in the beginning of the fifth century, appear to have introduced in the remotest parts of Britain and Ireland the obligations of celibacy and retirement from the world; and as the expression meant no more than that

the individuals in relation to whom it was used had devoted themselves to the service of God, and taken up their abode in cells, it is obvious that no conclusion can be drawn from it respecting the peculiar nature of their rule or institution. They were, as far as antiquaries can discover, the first order of monks that settled in the British isles; and wherever the Celtic language was used, the name of Culdee was given to every one who, relinquishing the temporal pursuits of life, joined the holy brotherhood for the purposes of fasting, meditation, and prayer.

Nor will any one question the probability that, as the Irish and Scots were taught by missionaries from Rome, of whom the chief were Ninian, Palladius, and St. Patrick, there would be the most entire unanimity among the converts, in that illiterate and uninquiring age, respecting the things they were desired to believe, and the usages they were commanded to observe. Besides, in Ireland, whence Columba had his origin, every thing ecclesiastical is understood to have been established on the Romish model; and there cannot be any good reason for believing that he had adopted any other rule, with regard to faith and discipline, than that which was held by his countrymen at large.

But the ritual of those monks, and their mode of celebrating divine worship, are matters of inferior import when compared with the scheme of a church polity of which they are supposed to have afforded an example. When it is considered that the Culdees first present themselves to our notice on the page of authentic history in the attitude of maintaining their right to elect the bishops in the several sees where they had their convents, it must appear surprising that their practice as churchmen should ever have been adduced as an argument against the antiquity of episcopal government. That inference, it is true, seems to be strengthened by a remark found in the volumes of the Venerable Bede, that the monastery of Iona had for its governor a Presbyter-Abbot, to whose authority, by an unwonted constitution, the whole province, and also the bishops themselves, were bound to be subject, after the example of their first teacher, who was not a bishop, but a presbyter and monk. It is mentioned, too, in the words of the same historian, that, when Oswald, king of Northumberland, sent to Iona for a bishop to instruct his people in the doctrines of Christianity, the council of seniors or presbyters elected Aidan, one of their own number, who was esteemed worthy of the episcopate, and having ordained him, sent him forth to preach. From this statement, interpreted on the foot of the letter, and without any reference to the practice of other monasteries at the same period, Dr. Reid derives the opinion, that

Aidan, the first bishop of Northumbria, under the Saxon dynasty, must have received presbyterial ordination.

Viewed on the narrow ground now described, the conclusion no doubt has a plausible aspect. Still the least reflecting reader must be disposed to inquire why the monks of Iona should have given the name of *bishop* to the brother whom they elected and sent forth ; and why they should have gone through the form of declaring him worthy of the *episcopate*. It is manifest, even from the tenor of the narrative, that the words bishop and presbyter did not in those days mean the same thing ; and, moreover, that the learned historian was not ignorant of the distinction implied in these terms. How, then, upon the principles which Bede is supposed to recognize, could it be said that a college of presbyters at once elected and consecrated one of their own body a bishop ?

There is only one way of restoring consistency to the narrative, and of explaining at the same the occurrence recorded by the annalist, which is, to conclude that the bishop attached to the monastery, and who in certain respects was subordinate to the abbot, was employed to consecrate or ordain the episcopal missionaries who were sent into the dominions of Oswald. This is the view which Lloyd, and most other writers on the same side, have adopted ; and, in our estimation, it may be supported with such a degree of evidence as will satisfy all who have not determined to sacrifice truth to the interests of a particular system.

We find, in the first place, that it was customary in other parts of the Christian world, at the very period, too, when the Columban establishment was in its greatest prosperity, to have bishops either actually in monasteries or specially attached to them for the avowed purpose of performing those official duties to which clergymen of a lower order were not held competent, and, in particular, the duty of ordaining young men, when duly qualified, to the service of the holy ministry. In the early times of the Church, monastic establishments were at once the schools and the colleges in which the clergy received their education ; and as religion and learning were thought to be very much advanced by the discipline of convents, the monks were greatly encouraged. So numerous and important, indeed, were the privileges allowed to them by the indulgence of the age, that they were, in a manner, wholly free from episcopal jurisdiction. In some monasteries of the western Church, they were for a while so entirely exempted, that the bishop in whose diocese they were had no control over them, and had no right to enter their gates except when they were pleased to solicit his assistance. In the African establishments, about the year 500, the inmates might choose what bishop they pleased in

the whole province, to ordain and perform other episcopal acts. It appears that whomsoever they selected for these ends, they were bound to him as long as he lived; but at his death they might employ either his successor or any one else, for they pleaded that they were not under any bishop out of duty, but of choice, except the Archbishop of Carthage, who was their primate. At a later period they were confined to the bishop of the diocese, so that he, and no other, was entitled to ordain, confirm, and consecrate new oratories.

It was determined by the authority of regular councils, in France and Spain, that none should be ordained in any monastery except by the bishop in whose diocese it was situated; but still such a solemnity could not be performed without the desire, or, at least, the consent of the abbot. We find, besides, that in the greater monasteries there was a resident bishop, elected by the abbots and monks, and consecrated by the comprovincial prelates, for the very purpose of doing episcopal offices when necessary. Of this kind, says Lloyd, we have examples at St. Martin's, near Tours, and in the monastery of St. Denis, near Paris, which had such bishops in them from ancient times; and we have an account of their successions for some ages. The like, remarks Usher, we have of the bishops that were in St. Columba's monastery at Iona, of whom there is mention in the Ulster Annals.*

These facts prove incontestibly that the ordinations in monasteries were performed by bishops, either belonging to those establishments themselves, or chosen by the abbots, with the view to such sacred offices. It is proved that councils were held to fix the relations which subsisted between the bishops and the monasteries in which they were invited to act. The superior and his monks, who, it is obvious, were the best judges of the character and acquirements of those under their care, pointed out, from time to time, the persons who were to be ordained; and then, the bishop, whose services were appropriated to the particular convent, proceeded to the act of ordination, and gave to the several candidates for the diaconate or priesthood, as it might happen, authority to minister in the Church of Christ.

With regard to the ancient Irish—the subject more properly before us—we may use the words of the Bishop of Worcester, who remarks, “Our adversaries would have it that the abbot and
“his senior monks did ordain those who were sent out of their
“monastery, and that not only into the lower orders, but into the
“order of bishops, as they show us in the example of Aidan and

* History of the Government of the Church, as it was in Great Britain and Ireland when they first received the Christian Religion. By William Lloyd, D.D., Bishop of Worcester, p. 163. Usher, *De Primord.* p. 701.

“ his successors. But this is so far from being true that I dare
“ challenge our adversaries to show any instance when the abbots
“ and monks, without a bishop among them, ordained so much as
“ one single Presbyter. I shall show, on the contrary, by many
“ instances, that it was necessary to have orders conferred in the
“ monasteries, (without which there could be no administration of
“ sacraments,) so bishops were held necessary on this very ac-
“ count, that they might confer orders on those that were judged
“ fit to be ordained in the monasteries.”

But it is clear, from the conduct of the missionaries sent into Northumberland, that they were invested with the office of a bishop, even in the sense in which that word is usually understood in our own times. Bede says, “ Aidan was sent forth from Hy, or Iona, to convert the Angles, having received the episcopate ; that he chose the place of his episcopal see in the Isle of Lindisfarn ; that there he was with his clergy ; and there was the abbot and his monks, who all belonged to the care of the bishop.” For his clergy he had divers persons who came with him from Iona, of whom one was called *presbyter suus*, and one or two *clerici sui*, in King Alfred’s translation. Besides these there were many Presbyters who came out of Ireland, who preached and baptized ; and so churches were built in many places throughout his diocese. He was, moreover, on a friendly footing with the prelates who had been sent from Rome ; he was even, continues Bede, “ deservedly beloved by them, and held in veneration by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of the East Angles ; and accordingly after his death he was accounted a Saint by them of the Romish communion.”

Aidan was succeeded in the episcopal duties by Finan, who, we are informed by the monk of Wearmouth, having baptized Peada, the King of the Middle Angles, with all his court, he gave him four priests, one Scotch, and three English, to instruct and baptize his people. At a subsequent period, Sigebert, King of the East Angles, with his friends, was baptized by the same bishop, and received at the same time two priests to extend the Gospel among his people. One of these priests, whose name was Cedd, having, with the assistance of his colleague, gathered together a great Church to the Lord, returned to the Bishop at Lindisfarn to inform him of their remarkable success in the work of evangelizing the Saxons ; and with this account Finan was so much gratified that, to enable him to prosecute his pious objects with still greater advantage, he resolved to raise him to the episcopal order. Seeing his success, remarks Bede, in the furtherance of the Gospel, and having called to him two other bishops for the ministry of ordination, he made him bishop over the nation of the East Angles.

The historian adds, that Cedd, having received the degree of the episcopate, returned to the province, and with greater authority fulfilled the work which he had begun, erected churches in different places, ordained presbyters and deacons, who might assist him in the word of faith and ministry of baptism.*

We have followed out these details with the view of supplying a satisfactory answer to the remark of Dr. Reid, that the "presbyterial order of the Culdees," joined to several points of doctrine and discipline in the ancient Irish Church, clearly indicates its opposition to the papal system. True it is, that the pope did not, without much difficulty, succeed in establishing his authority, as universal bishop, among the old British and Celtic communities. Not only did they question his right to such dominion, they also resisted the encroachment of his agents, even when armed with the secular power. Wales, Scotland, and Ireland, being remote from the centre of that influence which was established in Kent by Augustin, the Romish missionary, despised the mandates and repelled the overtures employed with the view of claiming their obedience and securing their submission. But in respect to the constitution of their several Churches, and the tenets which composed their creeds, they differed not in any essential point from the Italian ecclesiastics.

It is true that the precise computation, according to which the festival of Easter ought to be kept, was not yet fully determined in all parts of the British isles; the use of chrism in baptism was not everywhere observed; the celibacy of the clergy was seriously questioned, as well on the ground of apostolical authority as on that of discipline; and a violent schism prevailed among the indigenous priests, as to the true form of the tonsure, or shaving of the head, in the use of which they were disposed to claim an unbounded freedom. The ceremony of marriage, too, among the laity, the practice of auricular confession, and the interesting rite of confirmation, had fallen into a very general neglect among the Irish, whom one of their prelates in the twelfth century described as no better than "brute beasts."

In a word, it will appear to every unbiassed inquirer altogether beyond the reach of controversy, that the ancient Hibernians maintained the divine origin of diocesan episcopacy; that they believed in purgatory, whence, they thought, souls might be delivered before the day of judgment by the prayers and fastings of the living; that they practised, though not without occasional interruption, the duty of private confession; that they showed a veneration for relics, and imagined that miracles were performed

* Bed. Hist. lib. iii. c. 21.

by means of them ; that they consecrated Churches, and for this end used holy water, by which they believed that diseases might also be cured ; that they observed Lent and all the Wednesdays and Fridays throughout the year ; that they used the sign of the cross, attributed much value to a bishop's blessing, had monasteries, and paid the utmost respect to monks. Finally, they bowed the knee when they entered a consecrated place of worship, made use of holy oil for various purposes, followed unwritten traditions, and performed divine worship according to the forms of a liturgy.

No attempt, therefore, can be more hopeless than to establish by historical proof that the ancient inhabitants of Ireland were Presbyterians, or that their opinions on Christian doctrine and usage were different from those of the western Church at large, during the same period. In a recent history of Ireland it is remarked, that “ an attempt has been made, enforced by the learning of the admirable Usher, to prove that the Church founded by St. Patrick in Ireland held itself independent of Rome, and on most of the leading points of Christian doctrines professed the opinions maintained at present by Protestants. But rarely, even in the warfare of religious controversy, has there been hazarded an assertion so little grounded upon fact. In addition to the original link formed with Rome, from her having appointed the first Irish missionaries, we find, in a canon of one of the earliest synods held in Ireland, a clear acknowledgment of the supremacy of the Roman see. Nor was this recognition confined merely to words ; as on the very first serious occasion of controversy which presented itself—the dispute relative to the time of celebrating Easter—it was resolved, conformably to the words of the canon, that ‘ the question should be referred to the head of cities ;’ and a deputation being accordingly despatched to Rome for the purpose, the Roman practice on this point was ascertained and adopted.”*

Respecting the nature of the religious doctrines and observances taught by the earliest Christian preachers in Ireland, we have, says the same author, both in the accounts of their devotional practices and in their writings the most satisfactory as well as ample information. “ That they celebrated mass under the ancient traditional names of the Holy Mysteries of the Eucharist, the Sacrifice of Salvation, and the Immolation of the Host, is admitted by Usher himself. But he might have found language even still stronger employed by them to express the mystery their faith acknowledged in that rite. The ancient practice of offering up prayers for the dead, and the belief of a middle

* Moore's History of Ireland, vol. 1, p. 237.

“ state of existence, after this life, upon which that practice is
 “ founded, formed also parts of their creed ; though of the loca-
 “ lity of the purgatorial fire, their notions were, like those of the
 “ ancient fathers, vague and undefined. The only point, indeed,
 “ either of doctrine or discipline—and under this latter head alone
 “ the exception falls—in which the least difference of any mo-
 “ ment can be detected between the religion professed by the
 “ first Irish Christians and that of the Catholics of the present
 “ day, is with respect to the marriage of the clergy, which, as
 “ appears from the same sources of evidence that have furnished
 “ all the foregoing proofs, was, though certainly not approved of,
 “ yet permitted and practised. Besides a number of incidental
 “ proofs of this fact, the sixth canon of the Synod, attributed to
 “ St. Patrick, enjoins that the ‘ clerk’s wife shall not walk out
 “ without having her head veiled.’ ”

The conclusions now quoted may be, in some respects, too general, and perhaps not perfectly consistent with the evidence on which they are founded. But, at the same time, there cannot be any reasonable doubt that the Christians in the British Isles embraced the doctrines and adopted the usages of the body from which they had received the first principles of our holy faith ; and as there is in ecclesiastical history the most unimpeachable proof that the original form of the Church was episcopal, it follows that the clergy among the ancient Irish could be Presbyterians. Nennius, one of our oldest writers, narrates that at the beginning St. Patrick founded three hundred and sixty-five churches, and ordained three hundred and sixty-five bishops, besides three thousand presbyters ; a notice which, though it may appear to have a hyperbolical air, precludes the notion that their constitution was anti-prelatical.

Dr. Reid, overlooking or despising the authority of ancient annals, maintains that it was not till the 12th century, when the island was transferred to the dominion of Henry the Second of England, that the Roman doctrines and usages were fully admitted into Ireland. Adrian IV., who at that period wore the tiara, is represented as conferring upon the English sovereign a grant of the whole kingdom, on the express condition of his reducing it to an unqualified subjection to the papal supremacy, as well as to an entire conformity with the practice of the Italian Church. At that epoch, and not before, he argues, “ all opposition to popish innovation was silenced ; the Irish Church was completely assimilated in doctrine and discipline to that of Rome ; every remaining trace of its primitive purity and independence was obliterated ; and after the lapse of a century, Ireland presented the same religious aspect as the other countries of western Europe.”

It is amusing to perceive to what extent a strong prepossession in the mind of an author leads him to pervert the clearest records. Mr. Moore sees every where unquestionable evidence that the power of Rome was established all over Ireland in the fifth and sixth centuries, and that the rites approved by the successor of St. Peter were followed with the most dutiful submission in every church and monastery, from Dublin to the mouth of the Shannon. Dr. Reid, on the contrary, can perceive no evidence that the power of the Roman see, or the ceremonies which distinguish the Catholic worship, had obtained an assured footing in the provinces converted by St. Patrick until near the close of the twelfth age. The former, perhaps, sees more than a less partial writer could possibly discover in any authentic document now existing; the latter perceives nothing, because he has determined not to open his eyes, or rather, it may be presumed, to use the eyes of others whom prejudice had blinded. That the clergy of Ireland in the sixth century differed in some points of discipline and order from the clergy of the neighbouring churches, is plain from the disputes respecting the time of Easter and the form of the tonsure; but that they agreed in all essential points of doctrine is equally plain from the history of those very disputes, from the cordial reception of the Irish ecclesiastics in Gaul and Italy, and from the easy amalgamation of their rules with those of the continental monks.*

The state of the Irish Church, however, both before and after the Conquest, was deplorable in the extreme. During the eighth and ninth centuries the country was exposed to the invasions of the Northmen, who directed their fury against the clergy, whose comparative wealth excited their avarice. On the return of tranquillity, the possessions, and even the buildings belonging to the sacred order, fell into the hands of laymen, who were more able to protect them; and in many instances were retained, according to the custom of tanistry, by the members of the same family for several generations. This was the fate even of the Church of Armagh, the residence of the metropolitan of Ireland. During the lapse of almost two centuries it was occupied by individuals of the same lineage, fifteen of whom succeeded to it without interruption. Of these only six were clergymen; the rest were lay chieftains who, though they did not presume to execute the episco-

* Lingard, vol. ii. p. 357. "Though the moderns tell us that they did not admit the supremacy of the popes, no such information is contained in any ancient writer. From Bede we incidentally learn that on points of difficulty they were accustomed to consult the Roman Church (Hist. ii. 19), and to submit to its decisions (Hist. iii. 3). Cummin (he wrote in 630) in his letter to Segienus says that to obtain the judgment of the holy see, *missimus quos novimus sapientes esse, velut mater ad matrem*.

pal functions, enjoyed together with the title, the emoluments of the bishopric. It was to this prostitution of the archiepiscopal authority that Bernard attributed the want of canonical discipline among the clergy, and the prevalence of immorality and superstition among the people. To remedy such evils, the popes, for nearly a hundred years before the invasion, employed the zeal of foreign as well as of native legates; and Giraldus bears a willing testimony to the general character of the clergy with whom he had been acquainted. But while he praises their devotion, continency and personal virtues, he justly complains that, living in communities under the eye of their bishop and abbot, they confined themselves to the practice of the monastic profession and neglected the principal office of clergymen, the duty of instructing the ignorance and reproofing the vices of the people.*

The conquest by Henry II. did not improve the condition of the great body of the inhabitants. The jealousy of the English court, who wished to exterminate the native tongue, prevented those means of improvement which the government of a people comparatively enlightened could not otherwise have failed to supply. The benefits of the art of printing were not extended to the Irish language till after the Reformation. We need not therefore be surprised that

“The spirit of religious inquiry did not display itself in Ireland so early as in either of the sister kingdoms. The turbulent and distracted state of the island, its limited commercial intercourse with the more civilized countries of Europe, and its want of colleges and schools, were all extremely unfavourable to the introduction of new ideas in science or religion. The ancient faith, consecrated by time and defended by power, maintained an unquestioned sway over the minds of the ignorant and credulous natives; while the English settlers of the same faith, being chiefly intent on extending their conquests, were equally indisposed to indulge in controversy. A profound silence, therefore, on the subject of religion, universally prevailed. While the most important controversies were everywhere agitating the Romish church to its centre, Ireland alone of all the states of Europe, was involved in the stillness of death. Here, there were no external circumstances to provoke or cherish a spirit of inquiry. There was no political opposition to the temporal encroachments of the Pope to pave the way as in Britain, France and Germany, for overturning his spiritual domination. There were no extraordinary exactions to rouse the indignation of the people, long habituated to the most grievous oppression. There were no educated nobles to encourage inquiry, or patronize opposition to the ambitious claims of the priesthood. Nor were there any poets to expose the vices of the clergy, and, by the powerful aid of ridicule and satire, to open the eyes of men to their venality and corruption. We accordingly find not

* Girald. p. 745, quoted by Lingard.

here any of those precursors of the Reformation, discernible in the suppression of books and the punishment of heretics, in the increased vigilance of the priests and enactments against free inquiry, which, in other countries, both indicated and hastened the progress of the truth."—Vol. I. p. 19.

In a word, it has all along been the great misfortune of Ireland to have had institutions forced upon her, before she was prepared for them. Attached to England as a dependency, but not fully united as an integral portion of the British empire, she usually pulled in a direction contrary to that of the general movement. The principles of the Reformation were not asked by the Irish, but pressed upon them; and as they were offered by a hand whose benefactions had in most cases been urged by the terror of the sword, it cannot be surprising that they were not gratefully accepted.

The first protestant prelate was George Brown, who was consecrated archbishop of Dublin in the month of March 1535. Charged with the royal commission he hastened to his diocese; and in a conference with the principal clergy and nobility of the kingdom, laid before them his instructions and required them to acknowledge his majesty's supremacy. This proposal met with the prompt and decided opposition of Cromer, archbishop of Armagh, who defended with vigour the supremacy of the Pope, and concluded by pronouncing a curse on all who should dare to own the heretical monarch as head of the Church. But a parliament, which met the following year, realized all the wishes of the monarch, so far as such objects could be accomplished by legislative enactments. In the small portion of the island where English power predominated, public opposition was silenced in the midst of great secret discontent; while throughout the greater part of the kingdom, the adherents of the Romish church became at once more zealous and more devoted to her cause.

The archbishop found it more easy to purify his cathedral from images and relics than to remove from the minds of the clergy their attachment to ancient tenets and usages. In a letter to Lord Cromwell he says, "This island hath been for a long time held in ignorance by the Roman orders; and as for their secular orders they be in a manner as ignorant as the people, being not able to say mass or pronounce the words, they not knowing what they themselves say in the Roman tongue." On another occasion he repeats, "The people of this land be zealous, yet blind and unknowing, most of the clergy being ignorant, and not being able to speak right words in the mass or liturgy, as not being skilled in the Latin grammar, so that a bird may be taught to speak with as much sense as several of them do in

“ this country. The Romish reliques and images of both my cathe-
 “ drals in Dublin took off the common people from the true wor-
 “ ship ; but the prior and the dean find them so sweet for their
 “ gain that they heed not my words. Therefore send in your lord-
 “ ship’s next to me an order more full, and a chide to them and
 “ their canons, that they might be removed. Let the order be
 “ that the chief governors may assist me in it.”

In such circumstances no success could be expected, and no serious effort was made to attain it. The seed was thrown on the highway or the rock, and was either trodden down or withered away. There was no leaven in the lump to excite the slightest fermentation, and of course, it remained unchanged. The great body of the Irish people were not only quite unprepared for the meditated change, they were also strongly predisposed against it. The strong hand of power could indeed dissolve the monasteries and disperse the monks within the narrow compass of the English pale, but it could not prevent the growing attachment to a persecuted religion, nor hinder the formation of new convents in the less accessible parts of the country. It may therefore be asserted without fear of contradiction that the Reformation made no progress in Ireland during the reign of Henry VIII.

The latter years of Edward VI. witnessed a slow advance towards improvement both in doctrine and worship ; but the accession of his sister Mary, while it discouraged the new professors, held out many strong inducements to the adherents of the older form to persevere in their opposition to what they naturally regarded as profane novelties. Under her sway the Roman Catholic religion was formally restored by parliament, and the supremacy of the Pope again every where acknowledged. The Protestants, being still few in number, were not annoyed by the dominant party ; a circumstance which may perhaps be explained by the fact, that the civil rulers, having been appointed during the preceding reign, had a feeling of tenderness for the reformed interest. We are indeed assured that measures were about to be adopted for introducing the pains and penalties which characterized the government of Mary in England, for,

“ In the month of October, 1558, Dr. Cole, Romish dean of St. Paul’s, was dispatched with a commission to the Lord Deputy Fitzwalter, authorizing him to proceed with vigour in the detection and punishment of Protestants within his jurisdiction. The dean having arrived at Chester, was waited on by the mayor, to whom he showed with exultation his commission, and boasted of the severities which it would be the means of inflicting on the heretics in Ireland. This intelligence alarmed his hostess, who had devout protestant friends concealed in Dublin. Watching her opportunity, she removed the commission out of the box in

which it was deposited, and substituted in its place a parcel of similar size. Cole, ignorant of this exchange, proceeded to Dublin, and having presented himself before the deputy and council, he explained at length the pious intention of the queen in support of the Church, and concluded with handing his box to the secretary that the commission might be formally read. But, to the dismay of the dean and the surprise of the council, instead of the commission, the box contained only a pack of cards, with the knave of clubs faced upwards. The deputy, probably not displeased that he was so unexpectedly freed from the invidious office of a persecutor, humorously replied, 'let us have a new commission, and in the meantime we will shuffle the cards.'"*

No sooner had Elizabeth mounted the throne than the sanction of law was again withdrawn from the Papists and bestowed on their rivals. The Scriptures were soon afterwards distributed in Dublin, in an English translation, and thereby rendered available for instruction in righteousness, so far as the people were acquainted with that tongue. But with respect to the Prayer-Book, a rule, apparently very absurd, was enforced, namely, that where the minister, and of course, his hearers, did not understand English, the public service should be performed, not in the Irish language, understood by both parties, but in Latin, which was equally unknown to either. The reasons assigned for this singular arrangement, though they may have no weight in our days, were not altogether without foundation; for not only were the natives accustomed to Latin prayers, but their dialect, never having been used in literature, could not be expressed by means of the ordinary types. It has required all the ingenuity of modern times to reduce the Celtic to such a form of orthography as to enable even those who speak it to recognize its peculiar sounds when indicated by printed symbols. But there can be no doubt that the prevailing error on both sides was to enforce religion on the mere ground of authority, without enlightening the mind or directing the conscience: and the reproach implied in this mode of procedure falls more heavily on the Protestants, because they profess a higher respect for knowledge and for the lights of private judgment. It was, moreover, extremely unfortunate that the main points of contention were the "supremacy," and the images of saints. Had the former been left in abeyance, the greater part of the clergy, in the civilized parts, would have conformed to the new shades of doctrine; and had the latter been allowed to remain undisturbed, the mass of the people would have continued to frequent the churches, unconscious, at the first, of any change. In short, the citadel was assaulted, in both cases, without the

* This anecdote is given on the authority of the Hist. Collections of the Church in Ireland; but the truth of it is doubted by Leland.

precaution of regular advances, or the means of securing a safe retreat.

The Earl of Sussex, whom the queen had appointed deputy, though he perceived the reluctance with which the ecclesiastical changes were admitted, found himself obliged to summon a general meeting of the clergy, in order to tender to them the new oath of supremacy. As most of the bishops had been merely conformists to Popery, only two of them refused to comply. One of these, Walsh of Meath, not only declined to take the oath, but attacked with violence the Book of Common Prayer, warning his clergy and people against the use of it. For this contumacy he was deprived and cast into prison. Leverous of Kildare also rejected the oath, and defended his refusal principally on the ground of the sovereign's sex. Being asked why he scrupled at an obligation already taken by many learned and illustrious men, he replied that "all ecclesiastical jurisdiction was derived from Christ—that since he thought not fit to confer such authority on the Blessed Virgin his mother, it could not be believed that he would delegate supremacy to any other person of that sex—that St. Paul had forbidden any woman to speak in the Church, much less to preside and rule there—and that the same doctrine was maintained by Chrysostom and Tertullian."

It is not easy to penetrate the cloud which hangs over the Church of Ireland during the latter years of Elizabeth, the Reformation appears to have made progress in the towns and places of trade, but in the rural parts the new system was opposed, neglected, or altogether unknown. Several Protestant prelates were murdered from time to time, and among them the bishop of Ossory, who was on the eve of publishing a translation of the New Testament in the native language. The evils which are now felt and deplored were then begun. Every lord-lieutenant had his eyes opened to the miserable state of the country; every one suggested remedies; and at this day the same causes of derangement are at work, and the same melancholy effects are produced. Lord Bacon and the author of the *Fairy Queen* have both left their opinions on record; and it is worthy of notice that each recommended an increase of zeal on the part of the clergy, an enlargement of the means of knowledge, and greater facilities for intercourse with the lower classes. The former observes that these should go hand in hand with civil reformation, "some course of advancing religion indeed, where the people are capable thereof: as the sending over some good preachers, especially of that sort which are vehement and zealous preachers and not scholastic, to be resident in principal towns; endowing them with some stipend out of her majesty's revenues, as her majesty hath most

“ religiously and graciously done in Lancashire; and the recon-
“ structing and replenishing the college begun in Dublin; the
“ placing of good men to be bishops in the sees there, and the
“ taking care of the versions of Bibles, and catechisms, and other
“ books of instruction into the Irish language; and the like reli-
“ gious courses, both for the honour of God, and for the avoiding
“ of scandal and unsatisfaction here by the show of toleration of
“ religion in some parts there.”

Dr. Reid quotes from a volume of public records in Ireland a communication by a bishop of Ferns in the year 1612, which proves that the state of the country then was not much different from what it is at the present moment. “ As for the poorer sort, some
“ of them have not only discovered unto me privately their dislike
“ of popery and the mass, in regard they understand not what is
“ done or said therein, but also ground under the burden of the
“ many priests in respect of the double tithes and offerings, the
“ one paid by them unto us, and the other unto them. Being
“ then demanded of me why they did not forsake the mass and
“ come to our Church, their answer hath been (which I know to
“ be true in some) that if they should be of our religion no popish
“ merchant would employ them being sailors, no popish landlord
“ would let them any lands being husbandmen, nor let them
“ houses in tenantry being artificers; and therefore they must
“ either starve or do as they do. As for the gentlemen and those
“ of the richer sort, I have always found them very obstinate,
“ which hath proceeded from the priests resorting unto their
“ houses and company, and continual hammering of them upon
“ their superstitious anvil.”

The presbyterian Church in Ireland had its origin in the reign of James the First. The several rebellions under Tyrone, Tyrconnell, and O'Dogherty, led to extensive forfeitures in the northern provinces; and hence, soon after his accession, the king found at his disposal nearly six entire counties. To establish the peace and prosperity of this portion of the island, he resolved to plant it with settlers from England and Scotland; who carrying thither their reformed principles and industrious habits, would, he expected, at once improve the value of the lands, and disseminate the seeds of Gospel truth. In 1610 this scheme was found to have made considerable progress. Owing to the vicinity of Scotland, as well as to the enterprising character of its inhabitants, the principal part of the settlers in Ulster came from that kingdom. The north-eastern section of the province was first occupied by them, whence they gradually spread themselves over the remoter districts; and the south-western division was chiefly planted by the English, between whom and their neighbours there

existed the most friendly feelings. The decayed cities were now replenished with inhabitants; the lands were cleared from the encumbrance of superabundant wood; towns were built and incorporated; and in every quarter ample evidence was afforded of the peaceableness and industry of the new residents. It is said that the king had a "natural love to have Ireland planted with Scots, as being, beside their loyalty, of a middle temper between the English tender and the Irish rude breeding;" and it is added that the marshiness and fogginess of this island was still "found unwholesome to English bodies, more tenderly bred and in a better air."

The author favours his readers with an account of the settlement, in the county Down, of the Hamiltons and Montgomerys from Scotland, for which, we should think, these distinguished families will not be particularly grateful. In return for their interest with the king, whereby they saved Con O'Neill's life, they ungenerously robbed the unfortunate Irishman of two-thirds of his estate. To use the words of the original author, "Con has his life, and a third part, Montgomery has a third part, and Mr. James Hamilton has a third part. They are both made knights; but the king's pleasure was that Montgomery should have the precedency, being not only a gentleman as the other was, but an inheritor under him, and his vassal in Scotland. Besides, he perceived that Hamilton, through the efficiency of wit and friendship, had obtained the better share of the dividend. For besides that in the patent he engrossed many more Church lands, he was so wise as to take, at easy terms, *endless leases* of much more of Con's third part, and from other despairing Irishes, than Sir Hugh had done." These worthies, after plundering the oppressed natives, quarrelled between themselves; but they were nevertheless, according to Dr. Reid, "successful promoters of the Scottish plantation, and intimately connected with the subsequent vicissitudes of the presbyterian Church in Ulster."

The followers of these titled adventurers seem not to have occupied an enviable position in respect to character and moral qualities. "From Scotland," says a contemporary, "and from England not a few; yet all of them generally the scum of both nations, who from debt or breaking or fleeing from justice, or seeking shelter, came hither, hoping to be without fear of man's justice in a land where there was nothing, or but little as yet, of the fear of God. And in a few years there flocked such a multitude of people from Scotland that these northern counties of Down, Antrim, Londonderry, &c. were in a good measure planted, which had been waste before. Yet most of the

“ people were all void of godliness, who seemed rather to
“ flee from God in this enterprise than to follow their own
“ mercy. Yet God followed them when they fled from him.
“ Albeit at first it must be remembered that as they cared little
“ for any Church, so God seemed to care as little for them. And
“ verily at this time the whole body of this people seemed ripe
“ for the manifestation, in a great degree, either of God’s judg-
“ ments or mercy. For their carriage made them to be abhorred
“ at home in their native land, insomuch that ‘ going for Ireland’
“ was looked on as a miserable mark of a deplorable person. Yea
“ it was turned into a proverb ; and one of the worst expressions
“ of disdain that could be invented was to tell a man that ‘ Ire-
“ land would be his hinder end.’” “ Although amongst those,”
says another, “ whom Divine Providence did send to Ireland there
“ were many persons eminent for birth, education and parts, yet
“ the most part were such as either poverty, scandalous lives, or,
“ at the best, adventurers seeking of better accommodation, had
“ forced thither ; so that the security and thriving of religion was
“ little seen to by those adventurers, and the preachers were
“ generally of the same complexion with the people.” But, it is
added, “ while thus it was, and when any man would have ex-
“ pected nothing but God’s judgment to have followed this crew
“ of sinners, behold the Lord visited them in admirable mercy,
“ the like whereof had not been anywhere for many generations.”*

The change here alluded to seems to have been effected by the energetic ministrations of an enthusiastic class of men who migrated from Scotland ; justifying well the recommendation of Lord Bacon, who advised the sending over some good preachers, especially of that sort which are vehement and zealous and not scholastic. From the description of their character, as here given, we see little to praise in them, either with respect to sense or honesty. Nay, one of them, Glendinning, appears to have been positively mad. He had some sparkles of good inclination in him, yet was he found not solid, but weak, and not fitted for a public place.

“ He was a man who never would have been chosen by a wise assembly of ministers, nor sent to begin a reformation in this land. For he was little better than distracted ; yea, afterwards did actually become so. Yet this was the Lord’s choice to begin with him the admirable work of God ; which I mention on purpose that all men may see how the glory is only the Lord’s in making a holy nation in this profane land, and that it was not by might nor by power, nor by man’s wisdom, but by my spirit saith the Lord. At Oldstone God made use of him to awaken the consciences of a lewd and secure people thereabouts. For

* MS. history by the Rev. Andrew Stewart, minister of Donaghadee, 1645, and *Life of Blair*, both quoted by Dr. Reid.

seeing the great lewdness and ungodly sinfulness of the people, he preached to them nothing but law-wrath, and the terrors of God for sin. And in very deed for this only was he fitted, for hardly could he preach any other thing."

But this ardent preacher was not above those feelings of jealousy which cling so closely to poor human nature. For not being invited by his brethren "to bear a part in the monthly meeting, he became so emulous that, to preserve popular applause, he watched and fasted wonderfully. Afterwards he was smitten with a number of erroneous and enthusiastic opinions—and embracing one error after another, he set out at last on a visit to the seven Churches of Asia."

There is mention made of a deaf man "who would weep at sermons;" and by such signs those who were acquainted with him understood that he would express many things of the work of God upon his heart.

"As if to try the truth and reality of these changes of character, there were several persons in this and the adjoining parish, who were affected with violent breathings and convulsions, especially during public worship; and who considered these questionable symptoms as evidences of the work of the Spirit. But the prudence and discernment of Brice and Dunbar soon detected the imposition, and thus rescued the cause of religion from contempt and dishonour. When they conferred with these persons they did neither discover any sense of their sinful state nor any panting after a Saviour. Yet not content with this trial, the minister of the place wrote to his brethren inviting them to come and examine the matter, and when we came and had conferred with them, we perceived it to be a mere delusion and cheat of the Destroyer to slander and disgrace the work of the Lord."

In the history of religion, viewed in the light of its practical efficacy, there is nothing more perplexing than the source and true bearing of those excitements in the popular mind known by the term "revivals." In all parts of the world, and under all forms of Christianity, such occurrences have taken place. Wesley and Whitfield were often gratified with such proofs of their ministry; the Baptists have on record numerous triumphs of the same kind; the Independents, too, can glory in their success on similar grounds, and Ireland, Scotland, and America have from time to time presented the same phenomenon under a variety of aspects. The only circumstances common to them all are great ignorance and immorality on the part of the people, while the preachers are remarkable for a bold impressive oratory, forcible appeals to the conscience, and a fearful denunciation of the divine wrath. Nor is the result, generally speaking, less various than the means. On

many occasions a permanent improvement is wrought in principle and practice ; hardened sinners are converted from the error of their ways ; and the fierce habits of gross intemperance are succeeded by a sober and thoughtful life. But it cannot be denied, at the same time, that the effects produced by such causes are both ambiguous and temporary. The hypocrite advances to perpetrate his schemes of guile under a new cloak ; and the penitent, frightened for a moment from his sins, returns to them with greater avidity, and seeks a compensation for his short abstinence in a fuller and protracted indulgence. Again, as to the physical emotions, the groans, the sighs, and the convulsions which mark the progress of those changes, it would be unwise, if not blasphemous, to ascribe them to the benign Spirit of Grace, which worketh in the sincere Christian both to will and to do of the good pleasure of God. For example, under the madman Glendinning, already mentioned, some of the hearers fell into such anxiety and terror of conscience that “ they looked upon themselves as altogether lost “ and damned.” I have seen them myself stricken into a swoon “ with the word ; yea, a dozen of them carried out of the doors as “ dead : so marvellous was the power of God smiting their hearts “ for sin condemning and killing.”

If the spiritual melioration always corresponded to the bodily writhings, we should have less difficulty in determining the nature of the cause ; but when we find that the “ violent breathings and convulsions” were sometimes nothing more than a “ mere delusion and cheat of the destroyer,” we are thrown into a painful course of reflection, and see not whither the clearest reasoning would lead us. At all events there is no doubt that such rousings from the sleep of sin are extremely beneficial, especially among a rude people, pressed down by the stupor of guilt and ignorance ; for, though some may again fold the hands and relapse into insensibility, a number will keep awake, and, by their improved conduct, supply at once a check and a good example. The vehement and zealous preacher, therefore, is in many situations much more useful than the grave and the didactic.

On the foundation now described was the Presbyterian Church in Ireland erected. The contemporary historians do not conceal that the mass of the people were “ ignorant and profane,” and had left Scotland “ for debt, and want, and worse causes.” But, though bad, they were improvable ; and the present state of the country they occupy, compared with the less fortunate portion of it still under the dominion of the old religion, proves that they must have carried with them the seeds of civilization and knowledge. The conduct of their ministers, at that early period, admits not of a defence on any ground so satisfactory and intelligible. They were Presby-

terians in principle and feeling, and had, for the most part, quitted their native land because they could not conform to the episcopal establishment, or had, in some way or other, exposed themselves to ecclesiastical censure. Yet they hesitated not, so soon as they had crossed the narrow sea which separates the British isles in the north; but they accepted preferment in a prelatical Church, drew their tithes from the parishioners, and even aspired to dignities. They submitted to be ordained by bishops, refused not a presentation from lay-patrons, and imitated the example of the English Puritans, who, while they enjoyed all the rank and endowments of the Church, laboured to introduce by stealth the peculiarities of their own discipline and worship. “ They conformed just so far as would ensure their security and maintenance under the protection of the legal establishment. When succeeding prelates became more strict in exacting conformity, the clergy generally yielded, though with reluctance, the canonical obedience required of them before their superiors; but in the seclusion of their parishes they continued to observe the presbyterian forms, so congenial to the habits and prejudices of their people.”

This dishonesty was connived at and encouraged by some weak bishops who gave the bread of the establishment to men who were constantly endeavouring to undermine it. Knox of Raphe was applied to for orders by a Mr. Livingston, who, on account of his opposition to prelacy in Scotland, had been silenced by archbishop Spottiswood. “ Because it was needful,” says he, “ that I should be ordained to the ministry, and the bishop of Down in whose diocese Killinchy was, being a corrupt timorous man, and would require some engagement, therefore my Lord Clanabery sent some with me to Mr. Andrew Knox, bishop of Raphe. He told me he knew my errand, that I came to him because I had scruples against episcopacy, and that he thought his old age was prolonged for little other purpose but to do such offices: that if I scrupled to call him my lord, he cared not much for it; all he would desire of me, because they got there but few sermons, was that I would preach at Ramalton the first sabbath, and that he would send for Mr. William Cunningham and two or three neighbouring ministers to be present, who, after sermon, should give me imposition of hands; but although they performed the work, he behoved to be present; and although he durst not answer it to the State, he gave me the book of ordination, and desired that any thing I scrupled at, I should draw a line over it on the margin, and that Mr. Cunningham should not read it. But I found it had been so marked by others before that I needed not mark any thing: so

**“ the Lord was pleased to carry that business far beyond any
“ thing that I had thought or almost ever desired.”**

In this way were men introduced into the Irish Church, whose consciences, though they scrupled not at tithes and dignities, nauseated the forms whereby they were qualified to enjoy them. When at a later period conformity was required, it was called persecution; and the easy latitudinarianism of such men as Knox proved not less injurious to the individuals he wished to favour, than to the Church he was bound to uphold. A fearful reaction commenced in the reign of the first Charles. The determined spirit of Wentworth was felt throughout Ulster, enforcing compliance with the canons, and ejecting from their livings those dishonest incumbents who had accepted preferment without any intention to fulfil the conditions upon which alone they could legally hold it. During the government of this unfortunate nobleman, the presbyterians were subjected to much inconvenience, and some share of positive suffering; nor was it till the parliament assumed a hostile attitude against the king, that they ventured to solicit a redress of grievances. The progress of the Grand Rebellion enabled them to collect their scattered ranks, and to establish on a new and more creditable foundation their favourite discipline as a presbyterian community. On the tenth of June, 1642, the “ first regularly constituted presbytery held in Ireland,” met at Carickfergus, consisting of five ministers and four ruling elders. It should seem that several of the former were military chaplains; for each “ produced his act of admission to his charge or regiment in virtue of which he sat as a member.” We are told, indeed, that the “ first visible relief was by the
“ Scottish army sent from Scotland against the Irish rebels—these
“ generally consisting of officers who had no inclination towards
“ religion except in so far as the times and state who employed
“ them seemed to favour it; only their chief commander, Major-
“ General Monroe, was no unfriend but a countenancer of these
“ beginnings. However, the officers generally were profane, and
“ the bulk of the soldiers, yea, haters of the purity and power of reli-
“ gion. There was no visible encouragement in the country for
“ planting a ministry in congregations; for the inhabitants were
“ but few, and these much oppressed and burdened through the
“ maintaining of the army, which was much neglected at this time
“ in their pay. Besides, there was a stock of old Conformist mi-
“ nisters in the country, who had for their own ends gone along
“ with the Covenant, and yet returned to their former disposi-
“ tion. They were labouring to carry a faction in the army and
“ country for their way, and had many to back them, especially
“ men of most note both in the country and army, and in whose

“ eye the little beginning of a presbytery was despicable, consisting at first only of a few in the army and two men planted in the country.”

It is manifest that but for the protection of the Scottish army, Presbyterianism would at this period have died out in Ireland, as the “ men of most note” were by no means friendly to it. In the year 1644, when about sixteen thousand persons had signed the Solemn League and Covenant, there “ were only two actual ministers in all those boundaries, being above fifty miles in length and twelve in breadth, who have joined themselves to our ministry, and adhere to our discipline in all things.” Nor did they prosper more under the iron rule of Cromwell. Baptists and Independents then enjoyed the favour of the state, and a large sum of money was lavished every year for their maintenance. The Presbyterian preachers were cast out of their charges, and pursued from place to place by the emissaries of the republican commander. “ This,” says an old manuscript, “ continued throughout the summer of 1651, at which time there was diligent search made anew for them. Some were taken, others fled; and those who were taken were imprisoned first, for a time, in Carickfergus; and thereafter Colonel Venables, not gaining any ground upon them, they were sent to Scotland; those remaining in the country and not apprehended were only about six or seven; and these were now put to greater difficulties than before, being more earnestly searched after in their houses; yet they continued preaching in remote or private places, where the people willingly met them.”

This pressure was gradually lightened after Cromwell had attained supreme power; and, during the period of tranquillity thereby afforded, the fugitive preachers returned to their stations. The restoration of the Church and monarchy under Charles the Second, renewed, in some degree, their apprehensions; and it was not till the accession of William and Mary that they were blessed with a full toleration. At the present moment, the Presbyterians in Ireland not only enjoy religious freedom, the birth-right of all Britons, but they are moreover encouraged by receiving a suitable income, about 13,000*l.*, from the public purse; and they are accordingly, as Dr. Reid expresses it, an endowed though not an established Church. As they were originally a description of pseudo-Episcopalians, they adopted, as their creed, the Articles of the Irish Church, formed under the auspices of Usher, which Dr. Neile, in his *History of the Puritans*, takes pains to show comprehended the substance of the celebrated Lambeth Articles. It need not be added that the founders of the Presbyterian community were decided Calvinists, and that the same views of Chris-

tianity were received and conscientiously maintained by their successors during the lapse of two or three generations. But as has happened in this country among the Dissenters, those high notions of doctrine are said to have gradually sunk down into a species of Arianism, frequently taught and sometimes even avowed by their ministers; a departure from the fundamental standards of their belief, which cannot fail to have excited the disgust and resentment of every true disciple of the Genevan school.

Viewed as a literary performance, this work has many faults, some of which are inseparable from its plan and object. The narrative, for instance, is constantly interrupted by long quotations from obscure authors, men of no name or authority, who seem to have chronicled their own impressions as events passed before them, and to have recorded such occurrences only as might prove most agreeable to readers of their own party. The facts preserved by such writers, though they may be substantially true, are seldom given in connection with their proper causes, or placed in an impartial light. But without laying much stress on this circumstance, every reader will join with us in the complaint that such extracts encumber and perplex the story; that they prevent all continuity of thought; and, in short, that instead of contemplating a beautiful figure cast by the hand of an experienced artist, we have only the material which should have been melted in the furnace and run out into a proper mould. Instead of a regular narrative, it is a collection of what the French would call *pièces justificatives*; a mass of compilation of which the greater part should have been thrown into an appendix.

Again, when estimated as the history of a religious body never incorporated with the state, these volumes will be found to contain too much discussion on civil affairs, and on the general interests of the several governments which succeeded each other during the troubled period which began in 1687 and ended in 1688. In abridging the annals of that eventful time, so ably exhibited by our standard writers, Dr. Reid could not expect to recompense the labour of his readers by the delights of a more elegant style or the revelation of important truths. He ought, therefore, to have passed them at a more rapid pace, and contented himself with a reference to works which are in every one's hands.

We have, perhaps, no right to blame the spirit of partizanship which pervades these volumes; for such a feeling, when not allowed to interfere with the integrity of records and the rules of just inference, ought not to be hastily condemned. But it may not be improper to remind the zealous author, while bewailing the intolerance of the prelates, and their aversion to ministers

who entered a Church which, at the moment they vowed to obey its rulers, they secretly abhorred and had resolved to undermine, that the Solemn League and Covenant be so warmly recommends, bound a small minority in Britain and Ireland to overthrow the religion of four-fifths of their countrymen. It is cruel and unchristian in any nation, even when the great body of it is unanimous in holding the same principles of ecclesiastical polity, to persecute the smallest portion of the remainder; but, assuredly, it can be neither wise nor charitable in that smallest portion to denounce the belief of all the rest, and to bind themselves before God to use all means for exterminating it.

ART. IX.—*Charges of the Right Rev. the Bishops of Durham, Winchester, and Lincoln, in the year 1837.*

WHATEVER comes from the heads of these three great dioceses, must have a deep interest for the Churchmen of the empire; and, besides, these three charges are documents of importance on their own account. They all deal with stirring and solemn matter. We feel, however, that it is not for us to criticize these productions, or to make comparisons between their respective merits. While, indeed, too much value can hardly be attached to the regulating, checking, and controlling power of a sound and enlightened activity of public opinion, it may be with many a subject of regret to see a professedly ecclesiastical *press* erecting itself, more and more, into an arbiter of episcopal rule, setting bishop in opposition to bishop, and endeavouring to establish a new kind of *dynasty* in the Church of England. The end of these things may be disunion, disorder, and ultimate anarchy. And yet the subject is one on which it is far easier to dogmatize and censure, without sufficient examination, than to arrive at any satisfactory conclusion, when it has been viewed deliberately, and in all its aspects. Without, therefore, affecting to pronounce judgment, we may be allowed to state two or three facts. It is an obvious fact, for instance, and one of which the mention is quite compatible with the sincerest respect for the several bishops, that a great *want of unity*, both in sentiment and action, not only exists, but is exhibited, in the episcopal bench. Let us take that *verata questio*, the Ecclesiastical Commission. Some have imagined that it is calculated to occasion a soreness between the other orders of the Clergy, and the highest of all: but it is more to our purpose to remark, that, as far as we have seen, not one bishop, except those in the Commission, has expressed unequivocal satisfaction at the

arrangements proposed by the Commissioners. We leave the petitions and debates on the annexation of the bishopric of Sodor and Man to the See of Carlisle, to make their own impression. To the correspondence with the bishop of Ely, it would be painful to advert. But, as these published charges too clearly indicate, the bishop of Exeter, the bishop of Winchester, and even the bishop of Durham, are directly at variance, in a greater or less degree, with the bishop of London, the bishop of Lincoln, and the Bishop of Gloucester. It is not for us, we repeat, to say who is right or who is wrong; but, surely, these manifest and overt differences are much to be deplored, as tending to impair that unity, and therefore that efficiency, at all times so desirable, and now so needful, in the action of the Church. Thus, the following specimen is the recent statement of the bishop of Winchester; and we quote it without adding a single comment, and without entering upon the separate question which relates to his lordship's particular diocese. There is, he says, after some strictures on the Marriage and Registration laws,

"There is one other topic, arising out of a recent legislative measure, fraught with interests of so serious a character, and involving principles so important and vital, that I cannot think myself justified in passing it by in so cursory a manner. I allude to the newly-created Board of Ecclesiastical Commissioners for England and Wales. You have a right to expect from me, on an occasion like the present, the frank expression of my opinion as to the constitution of the commission itself, invested, as it is, with powers which, at no distant period, will virtually control every other authority in the Church, as well as in respect of the particular measures already recommended in their reports, so far as they affect this diocese.

"And, first, as to the constitution of the Board itself,

"I object to it,

"Because it exhibits the anomaly of a body corporate with perpetual succession, of which more than three-fourths are removable at the pleasure of the crown; and, therefore, in fact, at the will of the government for the time being.

"Because it presents the example of a board legislating in church affairs, composed partly of laymen, partly of ecclesiastics, the latter of whom are selected from a single order in the ministry; in opposition, as I conceive, to primitive practice, and the principles and precedents of our own Church.

"Because it arms that board with powers with which no commission ever has been, or can be safely intrusted; and not consonant, in my apprehension, with the spirit of the English constitution in church or state.

"Because it facilitates the enforcement of measures vitally affecting particular and general interests, at the fiat of individuals, without opportunity being given for public and popular discussion, and without the

concurrence—possibly without the cognizance—of the legally constituted and sworn guardians of rights and properties with which it is proposed to interfere.

“ And lastly, because, by its character of perpetuity, it presents at once a field for the agitation of successive inroads upon our ecclesiastical system, and provides a machinery for interminable changes; to the great disquietude of the ministers of the church, the distraction of their attention from their proper duties, and the inevitable unsettlement of men's minds upon the most momentous questions.

“ Secondly,—With respect to the measures already recommended, as far as they affect this diocese.

“ The most important of these may be comprised under two heads—the organic change proposed in the capitular body, involving a new application of the major part of their property; and the projected alteration in the boundary of the diocese by the transfer of most of the parishes in the deanery of Southwark to the metropolitan diocese.

“ And, first, as regards the reduction of the establishment of the cathedral to a dean and four prebendaries, and the augmentation of poor benefices containing a large population, throughout the kingdom, out of the surplus of the original endowments.

“ I cannot subscribe to the opinion, entertained, as it should seem, by the commissioners, that the endowments of capitular bodies were intended for no other purpose than as a provision for daily services, and the maintenance of the fabrics of the cathedrals. This seems a very defective view of the case. It is unnecessary to enter here into any detail of the various services rendered to the church by the cathedral institutions. They have been set forth with great ability in the remonstrances addressed to the commissioners by many of the chapters themselves; and especially the argument in their favour as nurseries of theological learning, has been very eloquently enforced in the memorial which proceeded from my own cathedral. Suffice it to say that there are collateral benefits, neither few nor inconsiderable, which were not left out of sight, and are not to be discarded as foreign matters, because not expressly noticed by the founders. And if it be objected, that, in point of fact, the fruits derived from the cathedral system have not always been as abundant as it is capable of producing, the reply is obvious. Rectify the abuse, if abuse there be—make the institution in practice what it is in theory—recal it to its legitimate uses—exact from it all the efficiency of which it is susceptible—enlarge, if you will, its sphere—amend—but do not destroy.

“ On these grounds I cannot concur in the propriety of forcibly transferring property, originally granted for particular uses, to general ecclesiastical purposes.

“ But again, for what poor benefices should the assumed surplus be made available?

“ Is it right or reasonable to establish a common fund, and proceed upon a principle of re-distribution, without any regard to local appropriation? Is it right or reasonable that the produce of tithes or lands, destined by original donation to objects connected with one part of the country,

should be transferred to certain towns and villages in another district? Is it right or reasonable to augment from these funds any other benefices than those belonging to the cathedrals? or to debar the parishes whence the property is derived, from reaping themselves the first advantage by the assignment of an increase of income to their officiating ministers? Or is it judicious to scatter this supposed surplus income over the surface of many parishes, and to raise the benefice in none effectually from the scale in which it lies at present? For it is obvious that if a living be incompetent to maintain a minister with fifty pounds per annum, it will still continue to be insufficient for the same purpose, although augmented to double or treble the value.

“I might inquire, further, why not consider the circumstances of each cathedral and diocese? Might not a principle of annexation be advantageously substituted, in many instances, instead of reduction to a common level?”—p. 13—17.

Again, that other elements of division should be introduced, together with a larger infusion of an *Ecclesiastical* spirit pregnant with democracy and irregularity, is an awful prospect. And yet it is another obvious fact, that the mass of the Clergy—hundreds at least among them—are overflowing with a fulness of zeal, which seems to find no adequate outlet in any authorized or established channel which remains to them. They have, therefore, recourse to new forms of combination, new vents for their feelings, new organs for expressing their opinions. Some contribute anonymously to newspapers, some get up societies and public meetings, some clamour for the revival of Convocation. Yet the difficulties and inconveniences which must attend this latter course can scarcely escape any sagacious and reflecting Churchman, and the observations of the Bishop of Lincoln appear almost conclusive.

“When we look at the character of the measures which have actually received the sanction, as well as of those which have been proposed for the adoption of the Legislature; and when we further consider that among those who possess the power of legislating, not only respecting the temporalities, but also the internal discipline of the Established Church, are men who, far from feeling any solicitude for its well-being, scruple not to avow their hostility to it; some because they dissent from its doctrines, others because they object to all civil establishments of religion—when we reflect on these things, we cannot be surprised that the Clergy should look forward to the future with anxiety and disquietude; that feelings of distrust and suspicion should be excited in their minds, and that they should wish the power of legislating upon points so deeply affecting their interests to be taken out of the hands of those who regard them with no friendly eye, and entrusted exclusively to members of their own communion. Every other religious community regulates its own concerns. Why, then, should this privilege be denied to the Church of England alone?—Reasonable, however, as the wish appears to be, I must confess my inability to discover any mode of accomplishing it. The revival of

the Convocation, either in its present or in an improved form, would not effect the desired object. Its acts must be confirmed by the Legislature before they can obtain any legal validity ; and their character may be entirely changed in their passage through the two Houses of Parliament. The Legislature, it is true, may, by a general enactment, confer upon the acts of Convocation the force of law ; or declare that no measure relating to the Church shall be entertained, until it has received the sanction of Convocation. But is the state of public feeling at the present moment such as to encourage the hope that a proposal of this nature would be favourably received ?—and might not objection be justly taken to it on the ground that it would produce that which has always been deemed the greatest anomaly in Government—*imperium in imperio* ?”—pp. 25, 26.

His Lordship's whole Charge is admirably lucid and perspicuous : and while it is among our first wishes, that the highest authorities of the Church should, on some points, come to an expressed agreement among themselves, and also undertake the settlement of others, which are now agitated and almost ruled by unauthorized individuals, as if no Bishops were in existence ;—while this is among our first wishes, lest internal mischiefs should arise, which now hardly seem to be anticipated or even suspected—we shall not venture to say more in our own humble capacity ; but shall have recourse to another extract from the cogent and forcible address of the Bishop of Lincoln.

“ That there is in the present position and in the future prospects of the Established Church much to create uneasiness and apprehension cannot be denied. Its enemies are numerous and active ; and, however widely they may differ from each other, are ready at all times to forget their mutual differences for the purpose of combining to do it injury. Well would it be if its friends would in this respect imitate their example, and combine with equal unanimity for its support. If, however, there is much to create uneasiness, there is also much to cheer and encourage—much to inspire the humble confidence that God will still cause the light of his countenance to shine upon us, and dispel the clouds which seem to be gathering over our heads.—We see pious individuals coming forward, with a liberality of which the last three centuries have furnished few examples, to build and endow Churches, and to provide funds for rendering the means of religious instruction in some measure adequate to the wants of our increasing population. The very violence of the attack upon the Church seems, under the controul of a merciful Providence, destined to contribute to our safety. By disgusting some, who were at one time indifferent or even unfriendly to us, it has converted them into friends ; while it has roused to active exertion others who, though friendly, had remained inactive, because they did not duly appreciate the magnitude and imminence of the danger. These proofs of affection, given at a moment when the Church stands in the greatest need of them, must be regarded by all, who believe the course of this

world to be ordered by the governance of God, as indications of his favour; as assurances that his support and protection will never be wanting to us so long as we are not wanting to ourselves: so long as each of us, in his vocation and ministry, zealously labours to promote the ends to which, be it always remembered, an Established Church is only a mean—the advancement of God's glory and the salvation of those committed to our charge."—pp. 28, 29.

We have only to subjoin, that the Charge of the Bishop of Durham, besides its value on other accounts, gives a most satisfactory account of that excellent and flourishing institution, the Durham University.

ART. X.—1. *First Report of the Metropolis Churches Fund, [up to] June 23, 1837.*

2. *Society for Promoting the Employment of additional Curates in populous Places. Preliminary Paper.*

THE Bishop of London's plan for providing the metropolis with new churches, is one of those which characterize the age in which they spring up; in part originating in a feeling of the times, but, again, rising beyond the ordinary level of that feeling, and raising it, and forcing it on with it. It is something characteristic, and, as far as it goes, a good omen for our days, that such a plan has been entertained at all; at least, it is well remembered by many now living, how a predecessor in the see of London, a loved, benevolent, energetic, and, as far as the times permitted, influential Bishop, made the same appeal, preached it, urged it, yet obtained not one solitary church as a monument to embalm the memory of "his zeal for the house of his God." Bishop Porteus was influential with the great, and used his influence, it is well remembered how; regarding himself as the chief pastor of his Diocese, he applied to individuals of eminent rank, who, by their Sunday parties, set the example of profaning the Lord's Day, and in two instances out of three, in that generation, prevailed. Yet, although influential, and, as this instance implies, fearless in using that influence, and courting no man's person, he was not permitted to lay a single stone of the temple of the Lord. The nation was absorbed in the prosecution of the continental war, a righteous war against infidelity, but carried on unrighteously, because self-confidently. Money was looked upon as the means of affording subsidies, or fitting out navies; it was regarded as the sinews of war; and the nation, which could without a murmur submit to raising 50,000,000*l.* a-year, for its favourite object, and could subsidize half the powers of Europe, would not devote one

ten-thousandth of its annual expenditure to the service of its God. It would purchase the favour of God cheaply—would, according to the inherited custom of more pious times, sing *Te Deum laudamus*, to the Giver of victories, or order National Thanksgivings for their more signal deliverances; but they went before their God empty-handed, they offered the sacrifice of a lip-worship, which cost them nothing; two pence out of each 100*l.* employed annually in this great struggle, would have built a lasting temple to their Maker's praise, and gathered a congregation of Christian worshippers, and fenced round another portion of Christ's sheep, and set a dam against vice and profaneness, and furnished a witness that we were a Christian nation, but they would not. "They set up their banners for tokens;" they worshipped the God of armies, "but Him, whose kingdom is not of this world, they regarded not;" they "drew near to Him with their lips, but their hearts were far from Him."

It is then much to have escaped so soon from times such as these; it is something favourable that such a plan has found acceptance at all. The severe "scourge of God" traversed not in vain every part of Europe, and shook in its devious course almost every throne. Napoleon was launched, like a comet, into each portion of our social system, carried trouble where he did not inflict actual desolation, and thus, not by his own will, conveyed warmth and life to the distant stars of our firmament, which, by his own will, he would have "drawn down from Heaven, and cast them to the earth" (Rev. xii. 4.). Russia, Germany, England, each in their degrees, suffered from his approach or passage, and each have had new energy and life conveyed to them through the destroyer and the waster. In his visitation, or his sudden disappearance,—when "all faces gathered blackness" at his coming, or when, his mission over, he was "driven into a land barren and desolate, with his face towards the east sea" (Joel ii. v. 20),—in his elevation or when broken in pieces, he was alike a messenger of mercy. A new era is commencing of fresh energy, in almost every nation whither "the grounded staff passed;" showing itself diversely, according to their different moral states; yet, although undirected energy must manifest itself in monstrous forms, still as the character of the eighteenth century was one of torpor and relaxation, so is that of the nineteenth of awakening energy. Much of the character of the past period will cleave to it; "*tamen suberunt veteris vestigia fraudis*:" it is not to be hoped that the effects of past sins and negligence will be blotted out by present zeal; we shall feel them, doubtless, besetting our steps, and encompassing us with difficulties, and staining our work as we thereby have stained the work of God, and we shall feel them as admoni-

tions, if, through His mercy, we feel them not in wrath ; still, though this must qualify our hopes for the future, and we may not look to it as likely to be unclouded, the light of our Father's countenance seems in a measure restored to us ; the present is not like the past ; the character of Germany is now on the whole one of commenced intellectual, our own of practical, vigour ; and both, unclasped from the fetters of an irreligious stupefaction, which made the one bow down before the idol of rationalism, and held the eyes of our own Church, that she should not see the richness of the treasures which she possessed.

There is nothing of largeness of claim, in saying that we are at the commencement of a new era ; such have taken place again and again since the Reformation, which was itself only one of such eras ; and they have been brought about, not always by great outward events, but even by individuals. Hooker* formed one such era, anticipating and forestalling in his meditative and ancient mind the results which were more generally brought out by the great rebellion : the revolution of 1688 formed another such era. It modified in a peculiar manner the relation of the Church to the State, not at once, but by a gradual and deepening influence ; it caused the selection of a peculiar class of theological views to fill the higher offices of the church ; a class, the very peculiarity of which was in many cases the absence of any distinctive peculiarity, or an eclectic latitudinarianism (as in Buruet and Hoadley) ; the separating off of the non-jurors cast disfavour over the peculiar character of English theology, which was embodied, yet probably narrowed, in them, for the most part, in that they were thus formed into a school ; and the loss of the part thus ejected was to be compensated by the accession of a proportion of a foreign material ; latitudinarianism again engendered unbelief ; unbelief required defences of the faith, defences of the faith distracted from the contemplation of the Object of faith ; and such must needs end in a meagre theology.

We can now look calmly back upon the last century, respecting the valuable names which were found in it, and which, though (*e. g.* Waterland) they attained not to the "three" were still "honourable" men. Yet with the period, the school of the last century has passed away ; they who most nearly represent it now, are not what it was ; it is broken up ; some have passed off into, or have taken into themselves, different shades of non-conformist theology ; and those who remain outwardly most true to it, have been obliged to cast themselves back more into antiquity ; not explaining antiquity by modern notions, but transfusing its feel-

* See Preface to the last edition of Hooker's works by Rev. J. Keble.

ings and notions into themselves. True theology penetrates the whole mass of human knowledge and thought ; it is its spring and soul, since "in Him we live and move, and have our being ;" and its history is consequently a mirror of the rest. The morality and evidences of Paley, the empiricism of Scotch so-called philosophy, the shallow history of Robertson, the sermons of Blair, the scripture exposition of Campbell, the theology of Burnet, the flippant remarks of Jortin on primitive history, belong essentially to the same spirit, and harmonize with the political principles of the century.

This period is gone ; nor is it any thing strange or contradictory, that precisely at this moment, wherever the relics of this worn-out age do exist, they exist,—not in their full vigour indeed, but in their full decrepitude. So it must ever be. We are in a state of transition ; and before the breath of the Almighty has infused life into the stiffened chrysalis, He allows the form whence it is to emerge gradually to lose its power of motion and apparent vitality, to contract and become rigid ; and it is after suspended animation that He bursts its bonds, and awakens it into its more spiritual existence. We seem to be extricating ourselves from the incrustation which gradually contracted around us during the last century ; but the shell, whence we escape, remains there undissolved, and blackening.

These then will remain, and, unlike the natural process, these prison-houses of reviving life are not simply conditions of its restoration and preservation, but instruments of trial, in that we have been brought into this state, not by any physical law, but as the corrective of past misconduct, and that misconduct in part still cleaves to us ; past sin becomes part of us. We are not only detained therein, but tried, by trial to be purified. And it is, in this respect, cheering to see how each succeeding trial is indeed the instrument of bringing out some new energy and life. As yet, in truth, the scourge has been rather suspended over us, to affright us into more diligent discharge of duty, than allowed to fall heavily upon us ; and so it is the more hopeful to observe how each threatened suspension of our privileges, has awakened some corresponding feeling, or called forth some answerable exertion. Each threatened breach in the walls of our Temple, has called out a living army to defend it. This is an earnest of what shall be. We seem (with humility be it spoken) not to need the last trial, whereby man is brought to an acknowledgment of his blessings, their loss ; the danger alone has been awakening men to a sense of their listlessness. Thus every one recollects, how the increased combinations against the Church, have determined multitudes, who before seemed, or were, indifferent ; and though in many this re-

kindled attachment shows itself, mingled with much earthly feeling, or even with a sort of ignorant air of patronage, as if, by professing their admiration or respect for the Church, they were doing her honour, not themselves; as if in supporting her (as the phrase is) they were not rather preserving privileges for themselves; yet this is but what is to be expected at the beginning of things: it is but the scum on the surface of the stagnant waters, which have been set free; as they flow on, they will become clearer and more refined. Again, in detail, the sacrilegious attempt to abolish church-rates, has more brought out men's feelings of their duty to "maintain truth;" not *any* religious form which men may chance to have set up, but the positive, real, objective, transmitted—truth. The abolition of the Test and Corporation Acts (little as it was intended) has had a tendency to restore discipline, and is setting the Church free to exercise it. The refusal of the state to prosecute blasphemy, involves the restitution of the Church's censures, as a guide to her children. Poor Laws were originally an interference with the Church; the Church's mode of maintaining poor is by the collections of the Lord's-day; but when the state had seized and squandered the wealth of the monasteries, then some other mode became necessary, to relieve the poverty whose home and refuge they had wasted. The plan devised by the state has been left to develope itself undisturbed; and when the evils of a scheme, begun on un-church principles, founded on confiscations of the patrimony of the poor, and carried on by avarice instead of charity, by mutual suspicion instead of mutual benevolence, became intolerable, then it became necessary to proceed still further, and the new plan (whatever be its merits in itself,) is a manifest violation of the parochial system, and breaks the bonds which connected the poor with their parochial minister, and their village Church. Yet this also has been working good; and has already, in some places, brought back the ancient, and more kindly, and more Church and Scriptural way, of weekly collections. So again, the absorption of our smaller bishoprics, and the threatened abolition of the ancient and venerated bishopric of Sodor and Mann, have very widely kindled, among the Clergy at least, the sense of the benefits of the more immediate presence of the bishop in his diocese, and his closer connexion with his clergy and people. The new Registration Acts, which were avowedly directed against the Church, have compelled the Clergy to teach their people, (what some otherwise shrunk from, lest they should seem to "preach themselves,") the claims of the Church to their allegiance, and to open more fully the doctrine of baptism, and the solemnity of marriage. The threatened destruction of the Cathedrals has opened the eyes of many to the

value of daily and intercessory public prayer, and of bodies set apart for that purpose.* The menaced appointment of unfit persons to fill the episcopal office, has made men look to the safeguards of those appointments, and the value of that office. The refusal of the state to aid the Church in the colonies or at home, in England, or the Canadas, or Australia, has in each at once roused independent efforts; the state has avowed that "every one is to do that which is right in his own eyes;" that she will not aid the one more than the other; that she "careth for none of these things;" nay, in Australia, she has preferred Romish error to truth, and so the spirit of those who love the truth has been stirred; yea, we may trust that the "Spirit of the Lord has come mightily upon" men whom He has called to the work. Certain it is, that a strong anti-heathen spirit is abroad. The stone under which we took shelter has been removed, and so (though, at first, in some confusion as must needs be) we see every thing in commotion to restore, or more than restore, the loss which has been sustained. The indifference of the state has become the energy of the Church.

In this energy, the two funds for the Metropolitan Churches and for "Additional Curates" form an era; and this, on account of the magnitude and definiteness of the undertakings, and the scale on which members of the Church are contributing to their execution. The proposal of the Bishop of London was, to do that by the aid of Christian individuals, which, a century ago, had been done by the then government, as a sort of offering to gain the Church,—to build fifty churches in London. This was a great and definite object, as much perhaps as this fund need supply; for in these cases, the first impulse is what is chiefly needed, to remove the apathy arising from hopelessness. When men see that things are not desperate, when the rise of fifty churches in our metropolis shall have shown that the gigantic work can be carried on by human hands, though neither the wisdom nor the strength is man's, then others will take courage; each chapel built is a pattern, and a pledge that it shall be followed, and so, though finally for the (thirty-four) "parishes, only, which contain a population exceeding 10,000, in London and its vicinity, including the parishes on either side of the Thames," not fifty churches, but above five times fifty, even two hundred and seventy-nine churches, will be wanted, yet if but the fifty churches be built, we shall have an assurance of the remainder. It were

* See e. g., Dean Chandler's Sermon on the Daily Service, particularly in Cathedrals. J. W. Parker, West Strand, (price 2d. per doz.) See also the Memorials of the Cathedrals, and some valuable references to earlier authorities on this and other points in "The Prebendary." Hatchard, Rivingtons, and Seeley.

stranger that men, seeing that the work can be done, and is blessed, should break it off, should neither be carried on by holy impulse, nor a glorious emulation, nor the sight of actual benefits, nor the hope of future reward, to complete the task,—stranger were this, than that they should have lain so long insensible to all this, or having so lain, been capable of being again awakened. Shall renewed health not complete that which an imperfect convalescence, after a long sickness, has well begun? The whole Christian course frequently, one might say generally, is wrapt up in the first act; all Abraham's giant faith and obedience lay in the seed, in his first leaving his country and his father's house; not that each separate act of obedience is not a distinct trial, and admits of the possibility of a failure; but that "to him who hath, more is given;" the first decided act of faith sets a man in the right path, thence to go onward with increasing strength and decreasing difficulties; and things harder in themselves become easier to him, because he is upborne with enlarged strength, and the resistance of his own will is diminished. And so in collective undertakings: the first footing in the land is the pledge of its actual possession; the first listening to a scheme is well known to be the assurance of its completion. Compare the late Mr. Wilberforce's first effort to attain the abolition of the slave-trade, and the scorn attached to it, with the negotiations with all the European courts, and the vote of forty millions sterling to attain, speedily and at once, what men came to think a Christian duty,—the abolition, not of the slave trade only, but of slavery, and who will think that the first beginnings bear any proportion to the completion, or that the times may not soon come, when it shall be recognized as a first principle, that it is our first duty to provide for the souls of men; that we have no right to build ourselves "wide houses and large chambers, and cieł them with cedar, and paint them with vermilion," (Jer. xxii. 14,) until we have built up houses of God for every portion of the Christian population of this land? Is it not stranger far, that any should now doubt it? Is man's bodily freedom a higher object than the freedom of the mind? or the wish to promote it, of necessity a more stimulating and more energetic motive, calculated to inspire greater sacrifices? The history of the early ages of the Church, and the foundation of the Gospel, bear witness to the reverse. Not by apostolic miracles only, but by apostolic faith, did the Gospel flash, in one century, like lightning, alike to Britain and to India.

These plans form then an era in our history, as a Christian nation, because they raise the scale of Christian charity, and set in a course in which themselves and the contributions, which now

seem relatively large, shall seem but the day of "small things." They appear to us great but relatively. Charity, it must be said, has hitherto been proposing to itself but to raise ostentatious sums at as little cost as may be; and since we are living on the confines of two periods, the ostentatious and cheap system of charity, as being the dregs of the former period, is being drunk down in the very last stage of its thickness. It is not endured thereby, but it is the very principle recognized, that charity is to cost nothing. Guineas are subscribed by the rich, and pence collected from the poor, on the very ground that they will not miss them,—not because God will repay them, but because they are too small to be an offering to God. Our model societies, the Christian Knowledge and Propagation of the Gospel, having been small private societies, and not what they now are, nor calculated to be such, furnished the example of guinea subscriptions; and societies which have nothing else in common with them, imitated them in this, because it was convenient to level all subscriptions, and it prevented the necessity of sacrifice; or wherein they have deviated has been in receiving subscriptions of half or a quarter of the sum. It may have been right to call in the contributions of the poorer; but why was the scale lowered on the one side, yet not heightened on the other? Why, but because people dreaded to give offence, or to deter subscriptions, or to deprive themselves of the patronage of the great, if the contribution should cost them anything; and so they have lowered the standard of charity of the country. As the giving what costs us something, strengthens the habits and the powers of charity, so that of giving to great objects that which costs us nothing, weakens it. Every annual guinea subscription from those whose daily income is thirty or one hundred, or even two or three hundred times, as much (for there are such), as their annual subscription, is a reproach to the system which we have adopted, and an injury to the donors. Men would not spontaneously have offered such pittances; they would have been ashamed of such offerings, had they not been *taught* to adopt a standard, which their better feelings would have rejected. We sweeten also the edge of our draught of charity, as if instead of being "marrow to the bones," it were gall and wormwood. We deck it out with bazaars, and balls, and music meetings, fearing not lest we should overlay it; we strive to out-do each other in plans, whereby to obtain the largest portion of money with the least portion of sacrifice; we hold it of less consequence *how* we obtain money, than *that* we obtain it; we increase luxuries to obtain charities; introduce a disease to further health; cozen people of their money and their reward too; and then boast ourselves of our charity, as if the charity of raising

money were comparable to the want of charity in carelessness how we raise it, as if we might redeem our carelessness of men's souls by the money which we thus carelessly, and so sinfully, raise for men's bodily wants, as if the Almighty Father were like ourselves, and loved the money for its own sake, or for what it might produce, not for the cheerfulness of the giver; or as if we might parade before Him what was won by this carelessness of that which bears His image and superscription—the souls of men.

These are the inventions of this age; they are the dregs of the decaying period; it is fertile, even to rankness, in devising new schemes of costless charity—bazaars, shilling or sixpenny subscriptions are its recent inventions; and it is of no long date, that people have learnt, that to eat, to drink, to dance, to assume fantastic characters, to listen to unmeaning music, to buy baubles, or, if the baubles be too costly, to gamble for them, are almsdeeds, charity, and good works, if so be that out of the, in some cases, vast expenditure, some little streamlet escape through to feed one of our established charities. And for the sake of sums so raised, we are to blunt our consciousness that every thing bestowed in real charity is a free-will-offering, and solemn act of devotion to Almighty God, which we would have presented unto Him by our merciful Intercessor, sprinkled with His blood.

We look then to these extensive plans, as so far forming an era, in that they are calculated to sweep away all this rubbish, turning in upon it the more healthful stream of self-denying charity. Any one, who looks upon either list, will see that the ratio of contribution is altogether altered; and among the contributions to the London Churches, not including the very highest and yet far from the very lowest, there are interesting and affecting cases of self-denial, which we trust will be known to the glory and joy of their givers at the Great Day.

These, then, are symptoms of a better state of things. That much dreary waste is still left bare and uncovered, is but what was to be expected—nor need it dismay us; the first stiff and prickly plant which rises from the sand which the sea has yielded up, is the sure harbinger, that in time flocks and herds shall there find pasture; the first few big drops, which fall but here and there in wide intervals, yet usher in assuredly the more plenteous shower. We would not be impatient; true it is, that in both these subscriptions, one misses with surprize and disappointment the names of many who are able, and others who, one should have hoped, had been willing, to stand foremost. One wonders, e.g. how that political body which has the name of the Church always in its mouth, should not see that the best way to support the Church is to build Churches; should not even see that themselves are weak

there, where they have neglected to do so, in our large populations, that the building of 50 or 100 Churches among the million and a half of our metropolis, would, with the moral, change also the political character of its inhabitants;—that had the sums which they, for some years past, have expended upon elections, been employed in Christianizing the electors, they would now have no occasion to employ any more;—that the entire source of their power and influence is the more or less Christian character of the people, and that therefore whatever tends to restore that character, secures the institutions which they value. But it is well that they should not see this; it is better, though we have to wait for it, that we should wait till they too are absorbed into the tide, and Conservatism, which in itself (whatever be many who are called after its name) is but the last form of the decayed and expiring system of the last century, shall be replaced by an enlightened and affectionate love of the Church, of which they are sons.

Neither also should we be impatient, although so many of those whose wealth is derived from, or expended in, the luxuries of the metropolis,—its great landed proprietors or the inhabitants of its houses, which are as palaces,—should have been so little awakened to the sense of their duties. None of them think upon the metropolis as their home; and it is a blessing that they do not. Their affections are away in the homes of their ancestors and of their childhood; among the trees, and woods, and glades of the peaceful country. The metropolis has not their affections, and they cannot at once feel their debt towards it. Nor do they know the extent of its needs—figures cannot represent it; one may, in vain, repeat that “in 34 parishes of the metropolis alone, for 379 Churches we have but 69, or, including proprietary chapels, 100; that we have little more than 1-4th of the number of Churches which we ought to have in these alone, in order to provide one Church for each 3000 souls.”* And yet that this calculation extends to but 2-3rds of the metropolis, it includes not the wants of half a million of souls. The numbers fall upon their ear, but they see it not, they cannot realize it; they see but the fair whitened outside, and know not the squalid wretchedness which lurks within a few yards of their own palaces; wretched because vicious, vicious because irreligious, and irreligious because never taught to be otherwise; outcasts from the Church, and so a prey to Satan. This must be brought by the Clergy in detail before them; they are men; very many benevolent men; but the whole subject is unhappily new to them, they have not had the occasions, which we have, of seeing the misery which this negligence has

* Bishop of London's Statement, republished in First Report of Metropolis Churches Fund.

engendered; they have, with us, too long stayed themselves on that broken staff, the State; are accustomed to think that these things *should* be done without calling upon them, and so are slow to make an unwonted, and, as they think, uncalled for sacrifice; they cannot at first see, that the negligence of the State has bestowed a privilege upon them, the high honor of providing for the wants of the poorer members of their Lord.

All this must be borne patiently; and it is to be feared that there was but little wisdom and little temperance in some journals, which repeatedly brought forward the names of certain Whig large landed proprietors in London, to shame them into giving. True, they do owe a great debt to the metropolis, which they have so fearfully enlarged; true, that their money would be safer in God's keeping than in their own; as indeed two of them, it is well-known, have at different periods lost sums, which would have built ten or twice ten churches, through those whom they trusted; happier far, had they trusted it with God! but religion and the relief of religious wants must not be mixed up with secular politics. Neither Whiggism nor Conservatism are in themselves religious, although the one accidentally is more connected with its establishment; it is not religious to support religion, so far as religion will support one's self, or one's views for the good of one's country; it may be patriotism and a civil virtue; and they who so act may be instruments of a share of blessing on their country, in that they seek to uphold what is a blessing, although themselves know not its intrinsic blessedness; but one need not say, that the religious statesman must seek to further religion for its own sake, though for a time the way of supporting it seems adverse to the success of his own secular views, to render his party unpopular with those whom he seeks to benefit, and so even to injure his temporary usefulness. Whoso will be a great religious statesman must look onward, risk much for the time, have faith in God, and commit his way to Him, must plight himself to religion to share her outward circumstances, "till death" do not "part" him, but unite him to her for ever. And this, Conservatism has not yet learnt to do; and it might be alleged truly, in reprisal, that the members of the present Whig administration (little as they have done) have contributed more to the metropolitan Churches, than those of the late Conservative; that the Whig member of Middlesex is the only layman who has given 2000*l.* to the same object. We would not then suffer ourselves to irritate these men or to be vexed at their delay; public papers, which may fall into any hands, are not the instruments to act upon them; nor the fear or shame of men the motives we should employ; they are men, we owe them tenderness; it is not their

money only that we want : we want money " which shall abound to their account " (Phil. IV 17), which shall be a blessing to themselves, their families, and their posterity. We see that the holding it back is a sore evil to them, that they keep it to their hurt ; we pity them for so doing ; they are tried with great wealth ; and the character of the century in which their habits were formed was unfavourable to habits of *proportionable* liberality. The scale upon which this effort is made, is new, and they were educated in a degenerate period ; they too, we trust, will rise above it ; but the *very* rich have been, by the very habits of the country, untaught to give in any proportion to their means ; the parade which is made of large donations, which rich men cast into the treasury, hinders them from giving largely ; they are taught even by the religious to be self-satisfied ; they are praised out of self-interest, (not in the lowest sense, but still self-interest, in that it is for the sake of institutions in which self is interested, and because self is interested in them) without any regard to the injury it may do to them, or the exertions which it may stifle ; they are taught that if they give out of their superfluities, their hundreds, or their thousand pounds, or roast oxen for the poor, or give blankets, or distribute meat, that they are models of charity. Whereas (though the thought which leads them to do this may be, we trust, in its degree acceptable) this diminishes not one of the luxuries which they have been taught to heap around themselves, interferes not with one fancy which they may wish to indulge. They are praised, because it is thought that the praise will induce or shame others to do the like, without regarding the injury it may do to them. They should be stimulated, instead of being taught to be content. But this will take time : and so we must be content to wait, till for these great works, their hundreds become thousands, and their thousands tens of thousands : and this, we trust, they will do, for the waters are now stirred, betokening the presence of God, and the motion imparted will spread to the parts as yet unmoved, until they at last burst their present boundaries of custom and self-indulgence and listlessness, and flow over with healing to the nations. Man will in time learn again to build temples to God, and houses for themselves, not palaces, or rather temples, to enshrine themselves, and huts for the worship of their God.

We have seen an American calculation how, in different ways, a portion of the unemployed wealth of our metropolis would have relieved their national difficulties and restored their commercial credit ; the jewels of our ladies, we were told, or the plate of their lords, perhaps a fraction of them, would, if sold, remove all the perplexities which overclouded the commercial relations of the United States, and which carried dismay into many parts of our

own country. Wealth then there is in store. All will recollect also how, in the last struggle with the scourge of Europe, the women of Prussia gave their ornaments of gold or precious stones to the royal treasury, and looked upon the iron cross as their noblest ornament. Even heathen Rome did the same ; and, in the spirit of the last century, in a political contest for a county seat, which cost each party towards 150,000*l.*, a lady of high family is reported to have said, “ I will pawn my diamonds sooner than —— (her son) shall not come in.” And shall such feelings be for ever called out only by immediate earthly ends ? is the spirit of early Christian times for ever fled ? or shall Israelitish women alone give their ornaments for the service of their God ? or shall not ours gladly give their jewels to the treasury of the King of kings, and receive joyously from Him the iron cross, which He shall acknowledge hereafter before men and angels as His signet ? We cannot think it ; we cannot but hope that the wealth accumulated in the metropolis is stored up, not to be wasted or destroyed, but to be let loose and unimprisoned and restored to the glory of its Giver ; we cannot but see in these beginnings a promise that men will one day see the true end of their riches, that they will again glory in beautifying the house of their God, that they will see it to be their glory to be adorned with good works not with costly array, will cast away what are now their idols in order to build temples for their God here, that they may be received into everlasting habitations ; that our women will part with their jewels here, that they find them set and sparkling in their everlasting crown, wherewith their Lord shall adorn for ever the brows of those who have parted with earthly things for His sake.

It is but a small beginning, that among the subscriptions to the London Churches, there are, at least we are informed, some three sums raised by parting with the ornaments of their owners ; the sums are small ; this was natural ; it is with such that the beginning must be made ; here also we must wait with patience ; the rich young man went away grieved ; the fishermen and the receiver of customs left all ; but in due time also, many were found to part with lands and houses, and lay their price at the apostles’ feet ; and so we hail these faint streaks, though in themselves slight, as heralds of a brighter, glorious day, and we joy in these two plans, as calculated to encourage sacrifices, which shall renovate the decaying spirit of our country, and restore it to the days of her youth.

It has been observed, that the clergy are foremost in both these plans, especially in that for providing additional curates for populous places. This was to be expected, and is as it should be. In the last century, the clergy assimilated themselves to the laity ;

by a wrong application of the principle of "becoming all things to all men" they thought to win, at least, the good disposition of the laity by becoming like them; they joined them in their amusements, cast a certain degree of decency over them, were a check at least to some offences; but they enlarged their houses, imitated the habits of laymen, received society in the like way, became, out of the Church, a more decent and well-behaved and restrained set of gentlemen. It is part of this new era that they are to be imitated, not the imitators; to teach, by their example, habits of self-denial, as they followed the teaching of the laity to self-indulgence; they must not stand upon punctilios, whether contributions for additional clergy be not rather the duty of the laity, they must put themselves forward to the work: if before men they are justified in abstaining, would they deprive themselves of the blessedness of this voluntary service? They must, by their example, break the yoke of custom, and give effect to their preaching.

But, there is a yet more difficult sacrifice for them than that of sacrifice of money, which they must hazard in this great cause; they must not only give liberally, but they must speak more boldly. It is our fault that these meagre habits of giving have so grown and indurated. The ancient fathers of the Church, in the courts of emperors, as among the unsubdued temperaments of Africa, spoke boldly and plainly against the luxury of their times, set before people what they were losing, taught them uncompromisingly, out of Scripture, the blessedness of abundant self-denying almsgiving, pointed to the never-dying crown, and bade them be "merciful, as they hoped to obtain mercy." Our homilies echo their language; our first preachers after the Reformation (*e.g.* Latimer), continued their spirit. And, if we would contribute to the coming of the kingdom of our Lord, which seems now to dawn upon us, we must break off the complimentary language of our speeches, our writings, and our sermons; we must teach men to be dissatisfied with themselves, not to be pleased with us; not to compliment us on our eloquence, but to carry off the "coal" in their own hearts, which, though it at first must make them uneasy, and, perhaps, dislike us, will kindle the flame of never-dying charity, which shall burn out all selfishness, and shine on to everlasting glory. We must be more plain-spoken, must teach men to look upon themselves as stewards, and their property as the property of God committed to their keeping, not (as most now do) to regard their riches as their own, out of which they may first satisfy themselves, and then give some of the overflowings to the service of God. We must offend some, that we may heal many. We must speak with tenderness, indeed, and gentleness, seeking to win, not to offend;

but we must state that which will offend some, who will "go away sorrowful," while others will give up that for which they "shall receive manifold more in this present world, and in the world to come life everlasting."

We cannot but think, that if the Clergy of the metropolis had followed out, more energetically, the scheme of their Bishop, greater results would have been already produced; we would have had them preach, not once or twice, but oftentimes; not speak of the plan as a thing desirable, but as an essential to our well-being; not recommend only, but *demand* support, in the name of their God and Saviour, and of those poor outcasts, members of their Saviour; press in public and in private, in season and out of season; preach a crusade against these luxuries and extravagances, which dry up the sources of charity: go from house to house, wherever they could obtain admission, and plead, as men in earnest, who realized the value of the souls for whom Christ died. We have reason to know, that many heads of establishments in London would have brought the subject before the members of those establishments, had the Clergy applied to them; this had placed the Clergy in their proper relation, and given the laity an additional interest in their Church. We trust that the Clergy will, in the ensuing season, even yet exert themselves; at present, we know only of two collections made in the metropolis itself, by the means of preaching.

Still, though there are too many traces that we are but in the infancy of liberal almsgiving, the degree of success, with which these schemes have been blessed, is very encouraging. The delays which were interposed, in the commencement of the Metropolis Churches Fund, by the hope of gaining some, who would not join in the work except they had the disposal of the appointments, and, finally, by the alarming illness of the Bishop, are well known. The difficulty of obtaining sites in the crowded city, where every foot of ground is thronged with human souls, and each tenement yields an ample profit, if not through the means, yet through the density, of its inhabitants, or its convenience for trade, has since delayed the building; and yet, before one stone of any new Church was laid, within twelve months of the commencement of the undertaking, above 117,000*l.* were collected; in the Curates Fund, although the committee has not been yet formed, some thousands per annum have already been pledged. If these be the first gushings of the rock, which the Lord hath caused to be struck, what shall the river be?

The facts of the Metropolis Churches Fund have been briefly told in the Report; four sites for Churches have been given, four purchased, the fee of three promised by Prebends of St Paul's;

three Churches almost roofed in in the desolate parish of Stepney, in which, out of 51,200, only 3338 had means of public worship; two more in preparation elsewhere, and *ten* more in progress, through the partial assistance of the funds. When these fruits shall have been seen, is it possible that men will hold their hands?

We would only add, that the expenditure has been careful; and, although we regret that it has been necessary to spend 1000*l.* in advertising, this is only a part of the awkwardness of our present system of subscriptions, and shows how much better was the ancient plan of parochial collections; still, compared to the amount raised, it is relatively small, $\frac{1}{17}$, whereas, in the Bible Society, some years ago, incidental expenses were $\frac{1}{7}$.

The Additional Curates Fund has not yet commenced its operations; but it cannot be too much pressed upon persons notice, that *it introduces no new principle or machinery into the Church, disturbs no existing order, has no untried elements, but simply proposes, preserving everything else as it now exists, to provide fresh funds, whereby our desolate cities may be supplied with pastors, and the pastors which they already have, be saved from wearing out their strength in contending with impossibilities. It introduces no risk, but only strengthens and restores our well-tried parochial system.*

And now, if we may speak freely what we think essential for the future success of these plans, we would first say, that we regard, as of great moment, that in the districts assigned to these new Churches, there should be no appearance of doing more than is actually done. It is worse than useless to divide parishes of 50,000, into five districts of 10,000, or even ten districts of 5000; this merely disguises the magnitude of the evil, imposes duties still impossible, and prevents their remedy. We trust that this sort of palliative will, on this new system, be abandoned; it is hypocritical, in that it pretends to do more than is done, and it has the reward of hypocrisy, in that it prevents the cure of the evil which it disguises.

The other point is of greater magnitude. No one can think on the promptness with which these two calls have been answered—calls put forth, in the one case, by an individual Bishop, in the other, for a scheme not as yet carried out in a single instance, and where the committee of management, though settled in principle, has not yet been formed—without being convinced, that if the heads of our Church were collectively to urge the needs of our whole Church and country, what has now been done, would seem, and would be, as nothing. Nothing is impossible to faith, because nothing is impossible to God who gives it. The wants of our Church might be presently supplied, were an

united effort made, and our bishops, as a body, to appeal and instruct our clergy to carry out the appeal, to the collective church. The energies of our Church have never yet been roused, nor herself appealed to collectively. It is not by the formal transitory circulation of a royal letter (although in its way useful), but by a continued appeal that she must be roused; and she may be roused, as Europe was by the voice of St. Bernard: "she is not dead, but sleepeth," and she may be again awakened, and raise herself from the dust, and be again clad in her beautiful garments, so soon, as with earnest Apostolic voice she be bid, in the Name of Jesus Christ, to arise. But, though in the course of human waywardness both will be done, it is not in the same time that men will "plant" and "pluck up that which is planted," "break down," and "build up;" and therefore in the name of the Church, (and we are confident that we are speaking in the name of the Church, although she has naturally been slow in expressing her sentiments), in the name of the Church we implore those of our Bishops, who have yielded, as they thought, to necessity, in consenting to the despoiling of our Cathedrals, to stay their hands, and the far larger number of these guardians of our Church who have not been committed to that act, to let their voice be heard loudly and decisively to save them; some at least of those, who have been for the time overborne, would not willingly see the consequences of the recommendations in which they have been involved. They would not willingly see the ruin which these schemes would entail, and for which, some, who have had no means of experiencing the benefits of our cathedrals, would principally advocate them. We have their warm genuine sentiments recorded, when free from this external pressure. "I am speaking,"* said our loved Archbishop, not as words of ordinary feeling, but when the ill-digested plan of a layman,† founded upon bare conjecture, had begun to tempt the cupidity of the country,

"I am speaking to those, who, (though in another capacity they may be charged with the cure of souls), appear in this place, not as parochial ministers, but as the members of an Ecclesiastical body, which, from its connection with a Church, the highest in rank, as it is the first in antiquity in this kingdom, is eminently distinguished among those corporations, which add much to the dignity, and, I may venture to say, to the usefulness of our National Establishment. Our forefathers, though they well understood the nature and value of a simple and spiritual worship, were of this opinion; and while they abolished useless foundations, and expelled from their Churches the gaudy decorations and ceremonial pa-

* Charge at the primary Visitation of the Archbishop of Canterbury, 1832, inscribed to the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury, and the Clergy of the several Deaneries, &c.—pp. 18—20.

† Lord Henley's.

geantry, which diverted the attention of the people from the proper objects of devotion, they deemed it conducive to the honour of God, to preserve many Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, with ample endowments, under the keeping of bodies of clergy, to whom from their qualifications and circumstances, the due performance of the service and the care of the fabric might be safely trusted. Regardless of the opposition which they had to encounter on this head, the monarchs and statesmen of those days were not to be moved from their purpose. In a later age, when these sacred edifices had been profaned and defaced, the clergy dispersed, and the property alienated by fanatical fury and rapacity, the Government, though under strong temptations of avarice, and having little to fear from resistance, continued to act on the same principle. It would indeed have been little to the credit of a nation, so highly favoured by Providence with temporal blessings, to have seized on revenues which had been appropriated to the service of God by the piety of less opulent ages. And I trust the time will never arrive, when, either religious prejudice or philosophical theory, or avidity, concealing its baseness under pretences of public good, will be suffered to triumph in the destruction of these Establishments."

We could not have the principle of retaining foundations for their specific ends, regardless of any "pretences of public good," more pointedly or explicitly maintained. As decidedly is it spoken in what follows (as it is implied in what precedes), that these institutions, at least, as far as relates to the residentiary body, were *not* for parochial purposes, but (besides pious learning) for the majesty of the service of God, which they who think that it can in any age be spared, know little of the secret springs of the human soul.

"The objects to which you are particularly bound to attend, *might be collected from the nature of the Establishment, if they were not especially determined by the statutes.* The general purpose is to exalt the honour of God, and show forth His Majesty with all the impressive solemnity, which can be imparted to prayer and praise, by voices and instruments in sublime and harmonious unison, assisted by the effect of an architecture as far above ordinary buildings in style and dimensions, as the simple greatness of nature is beyond the works of art.—But the awful solemnities of religious worship, and the magnificence of the structure, by no means complete the idea of an Establishment designed to be worthy in every respect of the Divine Majesty. Your Constitution embodies a number of persons of different ranks, and with different duties, entitled to benefits in various proportions, and of divers kinds. While some are invested with dignity, and charged with the responsibilities of government, the rest have their several functions, subordinate indeed, yet not without honour, in the service of God. Nor can we overlook the appendant foundations for the relief and comfort of the aged, and for the education of the young. An Establishment so constituted, if rightly conducted in all its parts, will present a picture of order cemented by charity, of authority administered with gentleness, and obedience yielded with pleasure, the highest providing for the good of the whole, and all in

gradation contributing their proportion of service till the measure of duty be full."

One lingers with a melancholy longing over sentiments so beautifully expressed, and so bright a picture drawn so touchingly, nor can we part with it without listening to the pious prayer, wherewith it is concluded.

"May the hymn and the anthem never cease to resound through its clustering columns and vaulted roofs, whilst its lofty towers proclaim to the stranger who visits the land, that her present generation are no less sincere than their fathers, in their veneration for the national religion. May it never again be polluted by the invasion of sacrilege, nor yield up to the spoiler the treasures which afford the means of its preservation."

Such were the matured and glowing sentiments of one who for nearly 30 years has, as a member or a guardian, been connected with our Cathedrals; and can we think that he would spontaneously yield up to decay, the fabrics which he loved with such intelligent affection, or himself lay the "spoilers" hand upon the very Cathedral, whose spoliation he here deprecates, and withdraw two-thirds of its revenues for objects, necessary in themselves, but necessary only through the neglect and "avidity" and penuriousness of others, and whose necessities may be amply supplied, so soon as a more noble spirit shall awaken, as it is awakening, in our land?

There is not the necessity by which some, who love our Cathedrals, seem to have been overborne. The country grudges not the foundations of the Cathedrals; people had misgivings about them, only while they were misled with exaggerated statements of their wealth, and ignorant of their original destination and character. They will not grudge, they will glory in them, if our Bishops will fill such of them as they have the disposal of, and earnestly intercede with her Majesty, that others be filled as they were once wont, with men of piety and learning; but least of all, will they wish to touch them, when they know that they were founded by individuals for distinct ends, (not according to the vulgar notion, to say masses for the dead, but,) "to the honour and glory of the holy and undivided Trinity,* to whom the founders willed that they shall remain consecrated for ever. "Cursed

* "We, dedicating the aforesaid close, site, circle and precinct, to the honour and glory of the holy and undivided Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, have decreed that a certain Cathedral and Metropolitan Church, with one dean a presbyter, and twelve prebendaries presbyters, there wholly and for ever to serve Almighty God, shall be erected, set up, founded, and established, and this same Cathedral Church, consisting of one dean a presbyter, and twelve prebendaries presbyters, with other ministers necessary for divine worship, we do by these presents really and fully create, set up, and found, and establish, and ordain that it shall be established and inviolably maintained for ever." Charter of the Cathedral of Canterbury; the like is the tenor of that of Ely, (see Memorials of Chapters, Parl. Paper, pp. 16—17,) and the rest.

is he who removeth his neighbour's landmark ;" but besides the sacredness which God has by this curse cast around all property, these were guarded by solemn adjurations, that they should be allowed to stand for ever to His glory, to Whom they were dedicated. Our forefathers gave what was their own to these holy ends, and to the glories and beauty of holiness ; and because we think men will now not give of their own for the barest supply of the spiritual subsistence of our Christian people, shall we take that which is still theirs, which they, it may be, are still looking on, (as their bodies oftentimes sleep within the shade of the Churches which they raised), which they adjured posterity to hold inviolate, and bound our Bishops by oath to respect and guard,* and not to betray. It ceased not to be theirs, nay it began to be truly theirs, because they consecrated it to God : it has not ceased to be theirs, because they have passed from among us ; they are alive, though not visible to us ; they " live to God ;" they have indeed no arm of flesh to repel those who would invade what, since while they had it on earth, they gave it unto God, is still theirs ; but they are in His presence, Whose arm is not the arm of flesh, Who hath said, " Cursed is he who removeth his neighbour's landmark," and who will revenge. Money so obtained can carry no blessing. It is cankered ; it would soon be dissipated, and leave no trace except a leprous taint, eating out the fabric into which it was received. But it would seriously check the daily rising spirit, whereby men are now being stirred up to emulate the deeds of their forefathers ; the contemplation of it has acted as a discouragement ; men love to part with their own for lasting ends ; they love to live on in the earth as benefactors to the Church in all ages, to picture to themselves generation after generation succeeding and profiting by their sacrifices, to do good so " long as sun and moon endure," to benefit the sheep of Christ, until the chief Shepherd shall appear, and earthly wants and provisions be no more : but if their will is to expire, like a copyright, some years after they are dead, and their gifts are to be resumed, not because the purposes to which they destined them cannot be fulfilled, but because a needy and parsimonious age would tamper with their consciences, supplying necessary wants by appropriating and perverting the liberality of other men, who will trust so unfaithful a nation ? Endowments have already been intercepted by the report

* " I swear to maintain the rights and liberties of this Church, and to observe the approved customs thereof, and, as far as it concerns the Archbishop, to cause the same to be observed by others, so far as such customs are not repugnant to God's word, the laws, statutes, provisions, and ordinances of the realm, or to His Majesty's prerogative, and not otherwise." Oath taken by the Archbishop of Canterbury at his inthronization, *Memorials of Chapters*, p. 6.

of these purposes, and the reputed insecurity of Church property; what will be the case, if (which God forbid) they should be realized? No! there exists, can exist, no necessity; the paltry sum of 140,000*l.* per annum (which as the other erroneous and retracted calculations of this board may show, will never be realized, but if it could)—this paltry sum can impose no necessity to trample on the wills of our forefathers, lay the spoiler's hand on these institutions, some of which have been contemporaneous with our Church, or give those noble fabrics, "which proclaim to the stranger," yea which impress upon ourselves, testify to the saints, bear witness before God, "that we are no less sincere than our fathers in our veneration for the national religion, to a certain and not slow decay." There can be no necessity to contravene the solemn adjurations of the yet living dead; their gifts are better far, untouched; where it can be shown that the character of their property has been unexpectedly altered, so that the gift should no longer be that which they intended, let it be modified; but let not the nation dare to disturb what is sacred as their ashes, the monuments of their piety! ἀκίμητος γὰρ ἀμείνων. Their dissipated wealth will carry barrenness, and dry the sources of piety, wherever it is scattered; but let this uncertainty which now hangs around *their* monuments, our cathedrals, be removed, let there be an earnest wish to carry out their wills (instead of first abusing their gifts, and then, by a double wrong, making men's abuse of their gifts a plea for wasting them,) and these beginnings of enlarged liberality, which we now see, will swell and multiply, and we shall obtain a double blessing, for having withstood temptation, and ourselves performed a duty. "Whose faith follow, beholding the end of their conversation." Filial piety to our ancestors is a foundation of national, as piety to immediate parents, is of personal prosperity: the honour of parents is the condition of remaining "long in the land, which the Lord our God hath given us."

* "The fabric can neither be maintained in its beauty, nor preserved from decay without repair." Charge, p. 21. The amount of expenditure on the repairs and decorations of the Cathedral of Canterbury in the ten preceding years is there stated (p. 23) to have exceeded 29,000*l.* "To this must be added the expense of rebuilding the Arundel towers, for which 20,000*l.* had been raised by way of loan," and more needed. The melancholy state of the Cathedrals of Normandy, which eye-witnesses have reported, shows what must be the fate of our own if the recommendations of the commission were carried out.

ART. XI.—*The Remains of the Rev. Richard Hurrell Froude, M. A., late Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford.* London: Rivingtons. 2 vols. 8vo.

THE first volume of this book, to which the following observations will be confined, presents an unusually perfect history of as remarkable a mind as it is often our lot to fall in with. It is remarkable, not merely for its talent, energy, and depth of religious feeling, but because the character in which these qualities issue, is one almost new to the eyes of this generation, and with this unusual tone of thought and feeling, is joined a deep reality and consistency, which forces attention, and perhaps deference, even when the author's views least coincide with our own settled prejudices.

The contents of the first volume are a Private Journal kept during the years 1826 and 1827, consisting almost entirely of confessions, resolutions, and prayers; about eighty pages of "Occasional Thoughts," running parallel with the Journal while it lasts, and then in part supplying its place till 1829; an Essay, written for a prize at Oxford, early in 1826; and extracts from his Correspondence, from 1823 till his death in the beginning of 1836. The second volume contains Sermons. However, before proceeding directly to these, it may be allowed us to make a few remarks which may serve to draw attention to the more important points in the author's character.

It would seem clear, that every religious system must receive much of its character from the predominance of what may be called the kindly or the lofty feelings—affection towards man, or desire after God. Scripture and reason equally tell us that the love of our brother, whom we have seen, is intended to train us up to the love of God, whom we have not seen; that the love of God, who is high and holy, is to raise, to deepen, and to direct the love of our brother, who is weak and despicable like ourselves. We are to love our brethren in Christ; Christ in our brethren. The insipid good nature which sees in its fellow creatures no more than beings capable of large measures of enjoyment, and whom it is pleasant to see enjoy themselves, is obviously as far from reasonable or from Christian love, as the heated fanaticism which thinks it finds God by overlooking His creatures. However, there is a wide intermediate range of character among those who neither neglect nor rest in their fellow-men. With some, those feelings of reverence and admiration, which seem like the voice of God assigning to every man his province, are more deeply touched by the quiet holiness of domestic life, its little

delicate self-sacrifices, its affectionate attentions and glad confidence. The idol of their hearts is one whom men love even when he is most severe, or, if they love him not, they dare not avow it, knowing that the world would hold them self-condemned; whose enjoyment it is to confer enjoyment, who moves about with a heart and sympathies open to all he meets, expecting no evil; and, when encountered by vice, rebukes it with a mixture of horror, pity, and simplicity, which, if they fail to convince, at least never irritate or harden. Not that such an one need be wanting in the expression of just indignation, but he shows no intention to punish, no assumption of superiority. He speaks either by way of affectionate remonstrance, or to disburden his own conscience; and those who are too bad to be affected by mere goodness, only say of him "that he is as kind-hearted a man as can be; pity he should let his fancies run away with him."

It need hardly be said that this is Christian love, but not its only form. Minds more bitterly alive to the unsatisfying nature of earthly things, will thirst after some more immediate form of self-devotion to God: and the same feelings which render their brethren less adequate representatives of their Heavenly Father in their hearts, imply capacities which render them less necessary. They will press as close to God as He will let them, anxious, if it were possible, to anticipate His purposes concerning them, watching for permission to throw away earthly comforts in His service, if He will give them the signal to take to themselves that honour; laborious by meditation and mortification of the flesh, to root out from their hearts every idle desire that interferes with His presence there, and to bend to His direct service every high taste and faculty which He has given them; who would sing songs to His glory, though there were none to hear them, and would adorn holy places though there were none to see them, anxious for no result, but for the mere happiness of devoting heart, head, and hand to His honour, if they have but an instinct or a word of His to tell them that He will be pleased with this their little offering. These men will no more forget their brethren than the others will forget God; they will have their words of encouragement for the penitent, of courtesy for the stranger, of deep affection for their friends. But they do not go about, overflowing with kindness and confidence to all men. Perhaps circumstances have thrown upon them one of those great works which ever lie about the world unappropriated, and they are "straitened till it be accomplished." Perhaps the work of their own salvation lies heavier on their spirits than on theirs who live and die in happy, quiet, uniform thankfulness. Perhaps their own renunciation of the lesser pleasures of life, makes them less understand the value

which others set on them. At any rate their constant endeavour to realize within themselves their own high aspirations, tends to unfit them for sympathising with buoyant earthly merriment, or sanguine earthly wishes, except it be with the passing interest which we give to the careless gaiety of a child.

Again, the stern examination by which they purge their own hearts, that they may be worthy of God, opens to them the secrets of others. It shows them what is their own meanness in the sight of God, and what it may be in the sight of their fellow-men; but it lays upon them the painful power of seeing through profession and self-deceit, and it teaches them how, by word and eye, to silence and chastise as well as to protest. And though they have sympathy for almost any extent of perplexity, prejudice, and weakness of intellect or purpose, yet they are not thereby inclined to deal tenderly with shallow presumption, or flippant levity, or proud disobedience. If precepts, or feelings, or practices, which they have learnt by much study and humility to appreciate, are, without the compliment of an investigation, sneered at or overborne, then they feel within them the power, and for the sake of those who will be led away, and of Him whose gifts are dishonoured, they are ready to take on themselves the responsibility of inflicting punishment. They are not satisfied with expressing their indignation, they wish to do it effectually; and to serve the cause to which they have devoted themselves, by impressing a feeling, as far as their influence extends, that serious things will not be treated in a proud or a random way with impunity.

These men, it need scarcely be said, are not talked of as "kind-hearted fellows;" they are felt to be partisans, and are revered or hated accordingly. Their presence, when it does not deepen the interest of conversation, is apt to impose a check on its freedom. Men are afraid of being frivolous and unreal in their presence; doubtful what will offend them; or what degree of forbearance they may reckon on; suspicious of their motives, as of men who do not speak freely, unless they speak with authority, of what they most deeply mean; and cautious in accepting their friendship, for it is only firmly given to similarity of religious aim. But the loftiness of sentiment which confines, deepens also the flow of their sympathies; their power of severity gives meaning to their affection, and their singleness of aim a high harmony to their thoughts and tastes. Those who will take their hand and walk with them, will find the fruit of their friendship rich according to its noble origin and tenure.

Now, of these two characters it would perhaps be overbold to say which is holiest; at any rate the loveliness of one is very

different from the majesty of the other; different, not indeed in essentials, but in the hopes, fears, tastes, and sentiments, which it forces uppermost. Most men probably look to some particular class of blessings as more especially God's gift, sent to them, like tokens from a friend in a far country, to say that He remembers them individually. The former character would see Him more touchingly in the affectionate friends, the comforts and the joy by which He gilded even the surface of His deeper blessings; the latter in the opportunities for lofty enterprise or well aimed self-devotion, accorded like an approving answer to their unsatisfied wishes. Most men have some prayer nearest their hearts, which wakens them up even when most cold and sluggish; with the one this would probably be that their friends might be blessed; with the other, that God would glorify His Holy Name—"Build thou the walls of Jerusalem."

But it is useless multiplying antitheses where the distinction is so broad and obvious. What is more to the purpose to observe is, that the later Church of England character is very decidedly of the former cast. Ours is the Church of Walton and Herbert, not of Athanasius and Ambrose. And truly we have been born into a beautiful inheritance. Our fathers have bequeathed to us the appreciation of a kindly and a holy spirit; a spirit of affectionate unobtrusive meekness, of considerate friendliness, of calm cheerfulness. And these are in their measure not only appreciated but realized amongst us; the domestic and social virtues of our clergy are in the mouths of every panegyrist of the Church of England, and are hardly denied by her enemies. Their intrinsic excellence, and the service they are daily rendering to the cause of Christianity, are every where before our eyes. But not content with thankfulness, we have been boastful of this grace of ours; we have spoken of it as if it were the only form of Christian love; as if no man could have any other line of action than to be frank and amiable, to marry and bring up a family, to be neighbourly to his equals, and active in relieving want, "giving no offence in any thing, that the ministry be not blamed." Now it may be true, that this is the line of active duty fit for most men, and ordinarily dwelt upon in the New Testament. But it is equally true, that "every man hath his proper gift of God, one after this manner, and another after that." And it is true, that there are passages of Scripture which address themselves to a very different class of minds; passages which *ὁ δυνάμενος λαβεῖν, λαβεῖτω*, which "all men cannot receive, but they to whom it is given." There are a whole class of expressions in the New Testament, which though surely they do not condemn the English Church, yet seem somehow not to have received their natural

developement in it. "If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast and come and follow me." "Blessed are ye when men shall hate you." "Woe unto you that laugh now, for ye shall mourn and weep." "Κάλον ἀνθρώπῳ γύναικος μὴ ἄπτεσθαι." "Every one that hath forsaken brethren or sisters, or father or mother, or wife or children, for My name's sake, shall receive an hundredfold, and shall inherit everlasting life." We seem afraid of these. We are anxious judiciously to point out that in these days, when Christianity is rich, men of "large possessions" are not called on to sell all they have; when it is established, to leave fathers and wives; that when Christianity is protected from injury, there is no expediency in remaining single; when it is triumphant, no reason why we should not laugh now. As if there were no heathens to be evangelized in foreign countries, no large towns in our own, no temples built unworthily for cheapness sake, no zealous poor left uneducated for the ministry, no lamentations in our Prayer-book over the disuse of practices which only the perverseness of our people can prevent us from reviving, no cause in our own hearts for sorrow and humiliation. Or in another view, as if the conduct of those who gave up all that riches or domestic comfort could give them, to devote themselves to a definite religious object, was a reproach to those who reposed in the bosom of their families. Within our own Church we are over careful to soothe enthusiasm, and somewhat helpless in directing it. In judging foreign churches or other ages, we talk of a "misguided zeal for what they consider the glory of God," "the fantastic rigours by which men render themselves callous to the sufferings of others," "the extinction of the domestic affections to aggrandize one ambitious Church," words which may be true or not, as they are applied, but which, as commonly used, are rather rashly bandied about, considering all the hints and recommendations that Scripture contains. We can be warm enough in our censures of those who would call down fire from Heaven, or sit at the right hand of Christ, but have perhaps too much fellow feeling with him who went away sorrowful when he found he must not only obey the law, but sell his property.

The book now before us is, most unquestionably, not of the peculiar Church of England character, but of that cast which we are somewhat apt to depreciate, or to look on as a romantic unreality. Whether we have gained or lost by suffering it to sleep so long amongst us, is a question on which some difference of opinion may be expected. Such as the author is, however, we shall endeavour to place before our readers some of the leading features of his character.

In his *Private Journal* which was written chiefly in 1826, when he was about 24, the feeling round which all others seem to group themselves, is a craving after an ideal happiness,—real and attainable, though not yet,—of which all our refined perceptions of beauty, nobility, and holiness, are but indications and foretastes, and in which, as our character becomes equal to our capacities, they must eventually converge. With this is joined, perhaps its necessary condition, a sensitive and pure taste for all that is beautiful or lofty to sight or mind; high, though unpractised, poetical powers; and an earnest appreciation of the reverence due to holy things; even to our own higher thoughts and deeper emotions.

This itself explains why these powers and feelings, lying it seems deepest, were unknown, almost unsuspected, by more than two or three of his nearest friends. His acquaintance more readily perceived and appreciated an unusually deep and true mode of dealing with mathematical questions; a subtlety, boldness and ingenuity of reasoning, a frank and accurate apprehension of the full force of an adverse argument, and a definiteness of conception and expression which seemed to cut through an intricate question, throwing off, rather than grappling with objections, with a cleanness which one could hardly believe not to be sophistry.

But this book derives its commanding interest from the stern self-chastisement of body and mind, from which both reason and imagination receive their tone and substance. With this the *Journal* acquaints us; and there is something which really crows an ordinary reader in the unsparing steadiness with which faults are sought for, the bitter self-abasement with which they are felt, and the unrelenting determination with which they are punished; all being recorded, except when addressed to God, with a plain and sometimes contemptuous homeliness of expression, which seems as if the author wished to do dishonour to himself and his thoughts, or held that a feeling which claimed to be deep and true, should not disdain to buy, by humiliation, the privilege of utterance.

The first volume places before us, with uncommon life and depth, the ulterior growth and developement of this character, which we shall now proceed to illustrate by somewhat copious extracts. The author's character as a boy is most interestingly given in a letter written, it would seem, by his mother, in the year 1819 or 1820, when he was about seventeen, with which the volume opens. From this it will be sufficient here to extract a few lines.

“Pleasing, intelligent, and attaching, when his mind was undisturbed and he was in the company of people who treated him reasonably and kindly: but exceedingly impatient under vexatious circumstances, very

much disposed to find his own amusement in teasing and vexing others, and almost entirely incorrigible when it was necessary to reprove him ;” but “ in all points of substantial principle his feelings were just and high ; he had (for his age) an unusually deep feeling for every thing which was good and noble, his relish was lively and his taste good for all the pleasures of the imagination, and he was also quite conscious of his faults, and (*untempted*) had a just dislike to them.”—pp. 1, 2.

In 1825, in which year he took his degree, passages in his letters show the existence of those romantic views of religion which occupy so prominent a place in his character from that time forward. Of part of the intervening time he speaks often in his Journal with very deep contrition : but any one who observes the deep humiliation with which he confesses faults of which ordinary persons would think but little,—common indeed to all who have really high views of Christian excellence,—will be very cautious in inferring much as to the facts themselves, from this most bitter recollection of them.

The Journal itself may perhaps be best introduced by some letters, giving an account of the first part of the time which it records.

“ *Sept. 28th, 1826.*

“ I have been meaning to write to you every day for a long time, and I do not suppose you would wish me to be influenced in putting off longer by the sad thing we have just heard. At least, if I may judge from myself, there is so little difference between what are called real afflictions and imaginary ones, that it seems just as rational to go on in the common way when under the former as the latter. With me this last summer, both at the time, and looking back on it, seems to have gone very strangely ; and I do not see any ground why my reason should contradict my feelings, because the things which affect me are either in their nature confined to the person who feels them, or are thought trifles by people in general. I have been trying almost all the long [vacation] to discover a sort of common sense romance ; I am convinced there must be such a thing, and that nature did not give us such a high capacity for pleasure without making some other qualification for it besides delusion. But the speculation has got much more serious, and runs out into many more ramifications than I expected at first ; and it seems to me as if I might make it the main object of a long course of reading, the first step of which would be to follow your advice in learning Hebrew and reading the early Fathers. This I have determined upon doing immediately upon my return to Oxford, and the intervening space I shall pass away as I can, with I. and P. among the mountains and waterfalls. Since I wrote this in the morning I have been walking with P., whose quietness of mind makes me quite ashamed of my speculations, and I hardly like sending you this letter ; however, if I have been making myself a fool all the summer, it is better I should not go on brooding on it by myself ; for letting somebody know the state of

my thoughts is the only way of keeping them straight ; and I know no one but you who would make sufficient allowance for me to venture on such things with. Perhaps you may think it very odd, but this is the first time I have had resolution to ask for the papers which they found of my mother's after her death."—pp. 200, 201.

The writer seems to have shrunk from allowing this letter to reach his friend. In its stead the following was sent.

"I have made three attempts to write, but all of them ran off into something wild, which, upon reflection, I thought would be better kept to myself. The fact is, that I have been in a strange way all the summer, and having had no one to talk to about the things which have bothered me, I have been every now and then getting into fits of enthusiasm or despondency. But the result has been in some respects a good one, and I have got to take very great pleasure in what you recommended to me when we were together at F., the evening before I left you our first summer, i. e. good books ; and I feel to understand places in the Psalms in a way I never used to. I go back to Oxford with a determination to set to at Hebrew and the early Fathers, and to keep myself in as strict order as I can ; a thing which I have been making ineffectual attempts at for some time, but which never once entered my head for a long time of my life.

"And now I must drop back to myself. I wish you would say any thing to me that you think would do me good, however severe it may be. You must have observed many things very contemptible in me, but I know worse of myself, and shall be prepared for any thing. I cannot help being afraid that I am still deceiving myself about my motives and feelings, and shall be glad of any thing on which to steady myself."—p. 204.

It is exceedingly interesting to trace in the Journal the actual working day by day of the feelings to which these letters refer. The following extract is in effect its opening.

"July 1, 1826.—I think it will be a better way to keep a journal for a bit, as I find I want keeping in order about more things than reading. I am in a most conceited way, besides being very ill-tempered and irritable. My thoughts wander very much at my prayers, and I feel hungry for some ideal thing, of which I have no definite idea. I sometimes fancy that the odd bothering feeling which gets possession of me is affectation, and that I appropriate it because I think it a sign of genius ; but it lasts too long, and is too disagreeable to be unreal."—p. 6.

"July 5.—I do not know how it is, but it seems to me as if the consciousness of having capacities for happiness, with no objects to gratify them, seems to grow upon me, and puts me in a dreary way. Lord have mercy upon me !"—p. 7.

These feelings continue occasionally to appear, assuming, more and more, a distinct and practical shape, till his return to Oxford in October 1826, (the period when the letters before quoted were written,) when they gave rise to the following resolutions.

" I have been coming to a resolution, that, as soon as I am out of the reach of observation, I will begin a sort of monastic austere life, and do my best to chastise myself before the Lord; that I will attend chapel regularly, eat little and plainly, drink as little wine as I can consistently with the forms of society; keep the fasts of the Church, as much as I can, without ostentation; continue to get up at six in the winter; abstain from all unnecessary expenses, in every thing; give all the money I can save in charity, or for the adorning of religion. That I will submit myself to the wishes of the —, as to one set over me by the Lord, but never give in to the will or opinion of any one from idleness or false shame, or want of spirit. That I will avoid society as much as I can, except those I can do good to, or from whom I may expect real advantage; and I will, in all my actions, endeavour to justify that high notion of my capabilities, of which I cannot divest myself. That I will avoid all conversation on serious subjects, except with those whose opinions I revere, and content myself with exercising dominion over my own mind, without trying to influence others.

" 'The studies which I have prescribed to myself are Hebrew and the Ante-Nicene Fathers.'—p. 25.

From this time the Journal becomes much more minute and severe. Till the beginning of December, the littleness of every day are sought out, analyzed, and exposed with a painful degree of earnestness and power. Of this it would be useless, and perhaps not very desirable, to give detailed instances. The constancy and comprehensiveness of the author's self-examination can only be felt from reading the whole journal as it stands. It will be better to confine our illustrations to the progress of that one feeling round which the others seem to turn. In this point of view, a letter dated November 5, is peculiarly interesting. It expresses to the friend, by whose advice he was regulating himself, the happiness which he felt at giving up the "wretched unsatisfactory pursuit" of guiding himself by his own judgment. The same feeling is recorded in the Journal for November 4, in a passage which is short enough to be extracted.

" I felt as if I had got rid of a great weight from my mind, in having given up the notion of regulating my particular actions, by the sensible tendency I could perceive in them to bring me towards my τὸ καλόν. I had always a mistrust in this motive, and it seems quite a happiness to yield the discretion of myself to a higher power, who has said 'Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you.'"—p. 37.

The following passages show a very striking kind of caution and deliberation in trusting his own romantic notions.

" Nov. 6.—I felt again to-day, as if I had been getting enthusiastic, and that the secret world of new pleasures and wishes, to which I am trying to gain admittance, is a mere fancy. I must be careful to check

high feelings ; they are certain to become offences in a day or two, and must regulate my practice by faith, and a steady imitation of great examples ; — *in hopes that by degrees, what I now have only faint and occasional glimpses of, may be the settled objects on which my imagination reposes, and that I may be literally ' hid in the presence of the Lord.' "*
—p. 39.

" Nov. 29.—I have just been shocked at hearing that —'s acquaintance, Mr. —, had shot himself yesterday. How strongly it reminds me that I understand little of the things invisible, which I talk and think about, when the most terrible occurrences having taken place quite close to me, affect me so little. *I could work up my feelings easily enough, but it is enthusiasm to anticipate in this way the steady effects of moral discipline, even supposing both effects are, whilst they last, the same.* I could not help crying violently just now, on reading over my mother's paper. The ideas somehow mixed up together, and forced on my thoughts, what a condition I may be in as to things unseen, and yet be unconscious of it.

" O God, keep up in my mind a feeling of true humility, suitable to my blindness and the things that I am among."—p. 56.

We extract the following philosophical reflections, taken from the Occasional Thoughts of about the same date, as similarly characteristic of the author's steady and systematic procedure.

" Dec. 1, 7, and 17.—It is the object of our lives, by patient perseverance in a course of action prescribed to us, so to shape and discipline our desires, that they may, through habit, be excited to the same degree by the objects which are presented to our *understanding*, as they would by nature, if we had *senses* to relish them ; that is, that the degree of our appetites for these objects, should so far exceed that which we feel for sensible objects, as the known value of the former exceeds that of the latter.

" The former field of existence is what I think St. Paul had in his mind when he spoke (Heb. vi. 19) of " that which is within the veil," into which Jesus Christ had gone before us. The veil signifying our unconsciousness, in spite of which, ' by two immutable things, in which it was impossible that God should lie, we might have strong consolation who have fled to lay hold of the hope set before us.' All this seems the real meaning of faith, as insisted on so much in the New Testament.

" Of the objects which we pursue or avoid, some we immediately perceive to be either present or absent ; some we only believe to be so through the intervention of the understanding. The various dispositions of our fellow-creatures towards us, are of the latter sort. We have no faculties for perceiving love or admiration ; but being conscious of the feeling ourselves, and recognizing in others the effects which we know to proceed from them, we believe their presence upon evidence, and are affected therewith. Of being in society we cannot be conscious, if by society we mean, not that of certain shapes doing certain things, but of beings which feel in some respects as we do. The existence of such beings we only believe on evidence, having observed effects like those

which proceed from our own feelings, in so many instances as to make it appear that the causes are likewise similar.

"The same sort of evidence we have of the existence of other beings, in some respects like, and in others different from ourselves.

"That a Being exists endued with power and wisdom, the limits of which we cannot reach to, is, I think, more certain than that we have fellow creatures. All men, whether they know it or not, act as if they believed in a Being endued with intelligence and power, and will superior to any interference. They count on the course of nature continuing as it is, because they know that what they have long continued to do they go on with; and rely without any doubt on its skill and ability for perfecting their undertaking where their own skill and ability fall short.

"That this Being has any other attributes, we have not the same evidence. These are the 'things within the veil;' they are *κρυπτα*, the objects of faith. But consideration will show that the difference is not in kind but in degree, and that among what we call the things visible, motives are proposed to us to be acted on, approaching to it by degrees imperceptible.

"Isa. xxv. 7, 9. 'And he will destroy in this mountain the face of the covering cast over all people, and the veil that is spread over all nations. . . . And it shall be said in that day, Lo, this is our God; we have waited for Him, and He will save us; this is the Lord; we have waited for him: we will be glad and rejoice in His salvation.'"—p. 86.

The Journal for Nov. 17 contains a determination to discontinue for a time the strict discipline by which the author was chastening himself, as interfering with the full discharge of his other duties, and proceeds as follows:

"Nov. 18.—I have slackened my rules to-day, and let go my dreamy feelings, that have been keeping me up. Bad as I am, it seems as if I might, not indeed be too penitent, but penitent in a wrong way; abstinence and self-mortification, may, themselves, be a sort of intemperance; *a food to my craving after some sign that I am altering*. They ought not to be persevered in, farther than as they are instrumental to a change of character in things of real importance; and the lassitude which I have felt lately, is a sign that they will do me no good just for the present. It is curious to see, how by denying one affection we gratify another: and how hard it is to keep a pure motive for any thing. The sensible way is to watch for our predominant affection, as each gets the uppermost, and give it our chief attention: *mine, just now, is impatience at finding myself remain the same, in spite of any difference of conduct I adopt*.

"Nov. 19. Having let myself loose for two days, I seem to have recovered my resolution, and feel quite ashamed of my want of patience, and inconsistency: besides, I hardly think I am at liberty now to alter resolutions I made at the beginning of the term. . . ."

"I am sure it is a good thing to act up even to injudicious resolu-

tions; to form a habit of thinking our present actions as not in our power. For we must be better judges at a distance, in general: so I pray God I may be protected from strange thoughts, and moral coils, while endeavouring to persevere."

It is very interesting to find the same date prefixed to the following extract from his *Occasional Thoughts*. And it is but one instance out of many which might be selected, of the manner in which his speculations are but expansions of his deepest feelings, very unlike the loose generalizations from a few half-examined facts, which it is so much the fashion at present to consider as the marks of genius. We have printed in italics the passage in the *Journal* which seems to have suggested these reflections.

"Nov. 18 and 22.—For whatever cause the great Author of nature contrived that resemblance (as it appears to us) which subsists between the part of His dominions, of the existence of which he has given us a consciousness, and that other part with which we are acquainted only through our understanding; it seems calculated to assist our conceptions of the one to observe what passes in the other.

"That people cannot help doing this, almost all metaphorical language is a proof, and whether this similitude is real or not, the belief that it is so may be of great service to many minds.

"The business of our life seems to be, to acquire the habit of acting in such a manner as we should do, if we were *conscious* of all we *know*; and in this respect no action of our lives can be indifferent, but must either tend to form this habit or a contrary one: so that those whose attempt to act right does not commence with their power of acting at all, have much to undo, as well as to do. *The craving, and blankness of feeling, which attends the early stages of this habit, ('show some token upon me for good,')* makes any thing acceptable which can even in fancy fill it, and it is delightful to see things turn out well, whose case seems, in some sort, to represent to us our indistinct conceptions of our own. Animals fainting under the effect of exercise, and then again recovering their strength, which that very exercise has contributed to increase; the slow and uncertain degrees in which this exercise is effected, and yet the certainty that it is effected:—the growth of trees sometimes tossed by winds and checked by frosts, yet, by the evil effects of these winds directed in what quarter to strike their roots, so as to secure themselves for the future, and by these frosts hardened and fitted for a new progress the next summer:—in things of this sort I am [altered in the MS. from 'we are'] so constituted, as to see brethren in affliction evidently making progress towards release."—p. 82.

We will close these extracts with a piece of poetry written in 1833, but singularly descriptive of that character to which his eye had been turned during the time which the *Journal* records seven years before.

DANIEL.

“ Matth. xix. 13. εἰσιν εὐνοῦχοι, οἵτινες εὐνούχισαν ἑαυτοὺς διὰ τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν· Ὁ δυνάμενος χωρεῖν, χωρεῖτω.

“ Son of sorrow, doomed by fate
 To lot most desolate ;
 To a joyless youth and childless age,
 Last of thy father's lineage,
 Blighted being ! whence hast thou
 That lofty mien and cloudless brow ?
 Ask'st thou whence that cloudless brow ?
 Bitter is the cup I trow ;
 A cup of weary well-spent years,
 A cup of sorrows, fasts, and tears,
 That cup whose virtue can impart
 Such calmness to the troubled heart.
 Last of his father's lineage, he
 Many a night on bended knee,
 In hunger many a livelong day,
 Hath striven to cast his slough away.
 Yea, and that long prayer is granted ;
 Yea, his soul is disenchanted.
 O blest above the sons of men !
 For thou with more than prophet's ken,
 Deep in the secrets of the tomb,
 Hast read thine own, thine endless doom.
 Thou by the hand of the Most High
 Art sealed for immortality.
 So may I read thy story right,
 And in my flesh so tame my spright,
 That when the mighty ones go forth,
 And from the east and from the north
 Unwilling ghosts shall gathered be,
 I in my lot may stand with thee.”—p. 315.

The impression left on the mind after a first perusal of the *Journal* is doubtless a depressing one, both from the unhappiness which it records, and (it may be) from a fear that if we would exercise the same strict vigilance over our own hearts, or would aim at the same high mark, we might find cause for disquiet too. It is a real satisfaction to find, both at the end of the *Journal*, that the author considers himself to have passed into a happier state, and in his letters, that he gradually ceases to speak of his own despondency, either openly to his nearest friend, or in those half jesting hints of which his other friends must only now feel the meaning. His external demeanour, both from natural disposition and from his contempt for any display of feeling, seems always to have been so full of life and energy, that from it alone, perhaps, no change in this respect could have been inferred.

This despondency we have not attempted to show in the ex-

tracts, though it does slightly appear there ; but rather his high desires to "enter within the veil," to be "hidden in the presence of the Lord," and the mode which he took to realize them. This forms a remarkable contrast with the self-confidence and unreality which too frequently springs from the consciousness of high views. It is, unfortunately, not often that we see men of bold and independent minds, subtle and comprehensive powers of reasoning, and romantic desires, giving up, till they shall be fit for it, all notion of "influencing others:" checking, without throwing aside their own high feelings, subduing, with a systematic humility, their impulses to express them, and submitting to learn their duty by the slow and common-sense process of "following great examples," "studying Hebrew and the Ante-Nicene Fathers," and in the meantime obeying scrupulously the voices of those whom they feel to be better than themselves. It is most striking to observe a mind like the author's, almost contemptuously regardless of the claims which mere number had on his acquiescence, and stubbornly unbiassed in his examination of evidence, yet prepared, on principle, to submit himself almost unlimitedly to the unproved dicta of superior goodness, or to what was, or was likely to be, the voice of Revelation ; seeing at a distance, as it were, the high character which he wished to attain, yet not hastily grasping at the feelings to which he saw it would lead, but repressing his own feverish impatience, and steadily waiting for his severe moral discipline to bring forth its fruits : happy lastly, and relieved to find that he might leave off seeking his own ideal perfection in his own way, and walk safely in a road which God had provided for him, without caring to understand clearly its direction.

It would require no small portion of self-deceiving good-nature, to make a person of these habits very well pleased with the tone of Society as it is. A man of a keen and lofty mind, who is struggling to love God with all his heart and soul, and finds the difficulty of doing so, though he may enter with ever so much readiness into amusements *professedly* trifling, and cordially acquiesce in the *omission* of religious subjects in general society, yet when high subjects are brought forward, cannot but be indignant and disgusted at the avowed selfishness, the flippant unmeaning carelessness of right and wrong, of religion and irreligion, which one finds not only admitted, but daring to take a tone of superiority there. Such broad facts as these, that even among many respectable men, it should be a confessed dishonour to have borne an insult patiently, none to be living a licentious life,—their unscrupulousness as to the men with whom they associate—the secular view which is taken of religious services, particularly the ordinary cathedral service—the masses who neglect the Com-

munion, and the nature of the reasons they give for so doing; these and the like are too often commented upon to need repetition. A short passage will show the view of things which was forced on the author by what he saw around him. On Hos. iv. 11, he observes, p. 138, "I suppose really abstinent self-denying people cannot conceive how it is possible for any one to divest *himself* so entirely of the fear of God, as the generality seem to have done. But a life alternating with mortification and indulgence (if it affects other people as it does me) might convince any one how easy it is to lose himself, how the distant prospect is made dim, and the heart taken away by present ease and satiety."

This, perhaps, Scripture would have taught him to expect—that he should find in the World not sympathy, but a field for exertion. But Scripture must have also taught him to look for some bold antagonist system to all this levity and worldliness; to seek in the Church an army, small perhaps, but united, organized, uncompromising, and proselytizing, whose noble attitude and words of high authority, scarce imitated by the crowds around them, would be almost at once his guarantee for joining their warfare and trusting their guidance. Would he find this in the Church of England?

Partly he would: he would find an active and pervading system whose existence and essential purity had been almost incredibly preserved through as grievous perils as the power or policy of men could well raise against it. He would find in it much of scattered energy, love, piety, and disinterestedness: he would find high names, and honour paid them. But it is more to our present purpose to turn to what he would *not* find. He would not find *authority*.

A candid reader of the 5th chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians, can scarcely infer less from it than this, that it is a disgrace to any Christian community not to exercise within itself an authority of formally punishing all vice *as such*. In that particular case, the body of the Church, "when they are gathered together," exercise this power, at the indignant command of St. Paul. In England the Church has long ceased, as a Church, to do so; the reason, we believe, being, that the State having become Christian, has taken her place in that respect. Passing by the question whether, under any circumstances, the Church could so transfer her duties, is it true that the State has received them?

In theory, whatever a few more old-fashioned individuals may think, the civil power itself disclaims the notion. The popular idea, and that received among statesmen who administer and frame our laws, is, that vice is not punished as *wicked*, but as *pernicious*. The question is not what is the religious notion of

civil punishment, but what is the received one; not what the English State ought to do, but what it does. And certainly it is almost universally understood to put forward, as its ultimate object, not the purification of a people to the Lord, but the defence of its people's rights, and the increase of their comforts. The Church is laying down what the State does not affect to take up.

It may be answered, that the prevalence of a theory among any number of individuals, even though legislators, does not imply its real adoption by the nation. This is worth considering, if the national practice, that is, the recognized law of the land, contradicts the popular notion. But what is the case? A number of instances will occur, when one is suggested, where a grievous crime is only recognized by the law as a civil injury. Take then for this one the case of the very man whom St. Paul commands the Corinthians "to deliver to Satan for the destruction of the flesh;" to what inconvenience would he be subjected by the English law. Principally this, that if he wished his property to descend to his children, he must be at the trouble of making a will; and that entailed property would not descend to them at all. Other punishment is left to the good sense and feeling of individuals. This would scarce seem likely to satisfy the Apostle.

This is one example of what is but an example itself. In our Church's teaching of truth, in its condemnation of error, in its assertion of its own spiritual powers and privileges, its warnings against rash interference even with its temporal ones, there would surely be something to disappoint those who had heard their duty in the deep bold tones of Scripture and antiquity.

Certainly so felt the author of these Remains; but another obstacle to his being satisfied with the practical working of our Church lay in those very high, half mystical desires to see and feel God in every thing, to which we have already alluded.

Part of our national character is certainly an uncommon contempt for feelings feigned or unduly excited; for unreality or false sentiment. Of this the English Church, wound up as all orders of it are with the nation, largely partakes. And certainly it has very many happy results which the author would have been the last to deny. Few men could have had a keener instinctive perception of any approach to pompousness or affectation; few, perhaps, were more able and willing to place it in its proper point of view, whether found in themselves or in others; few more ready to try high-sounding theories by practical tests; to ask what they meant when translated into common sense? what came of them? But all this did not interfere with his deep apprehension of the truth, that, after all, things visible *are* unsatisfying, that all on which our affections ought steadily to repose

is invisible, and that the realization of this is one of the three great and necessary Christian virtues. Nor did it reconcile him to a line of teaching not uncommon in the English Church, which seems so afraid of the profanity of unfruitful feeling and talking, that it will not supply a religious mind with those objects for which its affections crave: will only inform it of its duties, without allowing it to dwell on the nature and means of that communion with God which is the reward and life of well-doing. This forms so essential a feature in the author's character, that it may be worth while entering upon it at some length.

Now what is the nature of man in this respect? What is the meaning of the readiness with which wonders are credited and dwelt on by the common sort of people? of the fondness which we all have for stories of ghosts and witchcraft, even when we do not believe them; for fairy tales and romances, for any thing, in short, *marvellous*, independent, that is, of the ordinary laws of the visible world? Surely the least that this shows is that God has made us such as to be unsatisfied with the outsides of things, with mere physical and moral phenomena and their classifications. When we do not find a more immaterial system made to our hands, or sufficiently extensive to embrace all that we would have included in it, we coin one for ourselves, and look at it with interest, as a beautiful shadow of what we want, even when we do not attempt to persuade ourselves that it is.

Nor is this strange: the whole constitution of the physical world forces it upon us. All is magnificent promise, unsubstantial and encouraging. Is there not something very strange and pregnant in the mere fact that an assemblage of lifeless, senseless atoms should be enabled to excite in moral beings those apprehensions of beauty and sublimity with which the physical world doubtless does overpower us? Can these apprehensions be more, or can they be less than indications of great spiritual truths; a temporary and arbitrary system for training our minds to receive notions which are as yet beyond us? They are surely too noble to be more; too baseless to be less.

Again, what avenues of speculation does the animal kingdom open to us! We find ourselves surrounded by tribes of beings, grotesquely caricaturing or touchingly emblematic of fragments of our own moral character and condition; some vain, gross, stupid, or malevolent; others sagacious, persevering, brave, and disinterested. Each class (if we may believe those who have most studied their habits) including within itself, almost as marked varieties of temper and capability as the human race itself, but each bound immovably by an inherited nature within a certain magic circle of evil or good. Our own feelings seem to tell us that some of these are worthy of our attachment and admiration, yet

civilized nations, by a kind of unaccountable instinct, seem to have settled that they are not responsible: if they truly are not, how and why is this strange unreal vision of good and evil put before us? if they are, of what mighty and unthought-of system must they be the outskirts? Surely the commonest analysis of our every-day feelings drives us into what is ordinarily set down as mysticism, or superstition, or both. All nature seems to invite our affections but to reject them, and to testify of a greater system which is behind.

And even with our fellow men—are they adequate objects for our thoughts and affections? Practically, it is a plain matter of fact, that they are not. How are our affections and sympathies broken up and given away in fragments? We do not trust our whole heart to our nearest friend. We give part of our confidence to one man, part to another: we cannot give more, and should be stared at if we tried. When we wish really to sympathise with another's deep feelings, or to explain our own, how hopelessly do we fall short; and by what a chance does it seem to be that we succeed at all. Those burnings of the heart which we occasionally experience, on having sure signs that others do thoroughly feel what we do, or when a great system opens upon us, or when one whom we love performs a noble action, or when one whom we revere shows us unexpected affection, at once show us the emptiness of our ordinary sympathies, and are earnest of something greater. Such passing emotions betray to us capacities for a state of habitual feeling in which must be the highest happiness, and which we are as yet as unable and unworthy to feel as our friends are to excite. Is it conceivable that this union of high capability with actual unworthiness should be meant merely to point us forward to a future life? Surely, rather it sanctions those present desires which it causes, that blind craving after the supernatural, that worshipping of the unknown God, of which the highest and the lowest minds give common witness.

All this seems to justify us at least in demanding this, that if there is a revealed system calculated in every respect to meet those wants which are forced upon us by the natural one, it shall not be timidly kept back or mutilated, but that along with the duties shall be taught all that gives life and hope and happiness to their performance. And it would justify us in *expecting*, that if the cautious policy were pursued, the policy of not denying nor yet teaching, or, if teaching, doing so as if armed for controversy, in syllogisms and formulæ, always beginning from the beginning, and never daring to assume or expand what we believe ourselves, and say that all Christians ought to believe, that then men of more quiet and docile tempers indeed would submit themselves pa-

tiently, and would gain their own reward in acting on and propagating all that they did receive ; but that more active and ardent minds (who ought to form the great strength of the Church) would feel certain that they had not the whole truth put before them, and would think themselves authorized by that certainty to take their own training into their own hands, and seek it freely as they could for themselves in history, in the Bible, or in their own speculations. Ceasing to feel themselves scholars, they would be only too likely to deliver themselves wholly to the one exciting truth which first really met their wants ; and perhaps despise, and teach others to despise, as interfering with it, all that system of which it was in reality but one side or member. In other words, would become schismatics and heresiarchs. Have these expectations been realized or not in the history of the English Church for the last 150 years ? Numbers of earnest men, within and without, certainly *have* come to despise our ancient spirit ; and our disinclination frankly to blame them seems to allow that our own backwardness has led them to do so.

Now what is the system (if we would be but too true to ourselves), not which the Bible contains, not which the early Church taught, nor which is scattered in the works of our loftier divines, but which our very formularies imply. Let us contrast a few instances of a tone of teaching certainly not uncommon amongst us, and that which the Prayer Book almost necessarily presupposes.

Take the subject of inspiration, in connection with the human intellect generally. The apostles, we are often told, were commissioned to reveal a system from God, and supernaturally guided into all truth for that purpose ; but with the age of the apostles, inspiration ceased, and we, as fallible men, must be content to arrive at truth by the humble and candid use of those powers of intellect which God has given to guide us. Hence follows the heavy responsibility which lies on all of us, of seeking divine truth with humility, candour, and industry ; and on this, perhaps, is built a course of useful and sensible cautions. *All* this is in a sense true, and most necessary to be insisted on. But there is another way of viewing it.

The collects in the Prayer Book imply, what indeed no Christian would question, the constant presence of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of all Christians, suggesting thoughts and desires : and the Homilies ascribe directly to God expressions in books, of which the English Church refuses to assert the infallibility. Why then do we shrink from allowing in so many words, that as in the Jewish, so more fully in the Christian Church, there is, and has been always, a system of inspiration going on, of which we can-

not presume to define the extent? So far as we feel certain of their depth and truth, why are we forbidden to feel for those Christian authors, whom we most love and obey, all that the Homily expresses of the prophet Baruch? Without interfering with the superior and universal inspiration of Scripture, what an awful light does this throw on our treatment of our own thoughts; on all serious conversation; on disrespect shown to the suggestions of good men! This is exactly the way in which some men wish to view every thing, and because they are not encouraged to do so by us, they join our adversaries. Why do we drive them from us? Are these bolder forms of statement irrational? That would scarcely be said. No one will pretend to maintain either that his own will always excites thoughts in his mind, or that he can discover any unvarying law by which external objects do so. Are they unscriptural? The Jewish prophets speak of the days in which we live as blessed by a peculiar presence of the Lord. Their own Church was scarcely ever without its accredited messengers from heaven. Must we, of whose state their privileges were but the shadow, speak as if for 1700 years the voice of God had been silent amongst us? Are they contrary to antiquity? The early Fathers held the comfortable doctrine, that even heathenism was not without its share of divine suggestions, that even Socrates and Plato were unconsciously guided not only to instruct their own age, but to plant in the minds of men notions which were to ripen in Christianity. Will they foster rashness and presumption? Any doctrine may be misused to any purpose, but one does not expect a man to be made rash by feeling strongly that any given thought of his heart may be from God, may be from the devil.

Again, as to the world of spiritual beings, angels, and those who are dead in Christ. The ordinary way of speaking is, that it is better not to dwell on what God has left uncertain. This, perhaps, is rather a loose way of ruling the question. However, has God left it uncertain? St. Paul surely neither thought so himself, nor contemplated the possibility of others thinking so, when he spoke of the apostles as a spectacle to angels and to men, of the Church's wrestling not against flesh and blood, but against principalities and powers, *πρὸς τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς κοινῆς ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις*. He considered this world as a theatre of war between good and evil spirits, and made this knowledge a *practical principle*, just what we, on system, avoid. What does the Prayer Book say? On St. Michael's day we pray God for the succour and defence of His holy angels. And our attention is directed, not only to parts of Scripture which tell us of the "war in heaven," and *extraordinary* angelic interferences in earthly matters, but to others which, as

so selected, must imply that individual angels have *ordinarily* under their charge the affairs of particular nations (Dan. x.) and of individuals (Matt. xviii. 10). And as to those who are "with Christ," arguments doubtless have been raised concerning their state, not however because Scripture is *silent*, but because it *appears contradictory*; from which no intention can possibly be inferred that the truth, whatever it is, should remain unpractical. The Burial Service pronounces that the "spirits of the just" are "with God in joy and felicity;" and the Communion of Saints is one of those things in which every day "the Holy Church throughout the world" acknowledges the Almighty. If we know that those whom we love most are in this joy, is there any thing so unholy in hoping that God is ever increasing it upon them; that they think of us, and continue for us those prayers which they made on earth? This surely is not an incredibly close communion. And is God such a hard Father that we should not express those hopes to him? Farther, if there is no *positive command* in Scripture against dwelling on mere possibilities, what greater aid is there towards realizing the certain presence of Him whom we have not seen, what more analogous to his ordinary mode of training us, than the feeling that our secrecy may be watched by these dear and holy friends whom we have. "But," it will be instantly cried, "this leads us straight to the worst parts of Romanism." If these affections are true, and we will guard the rest of our conduct, they can but lead us right. It is hard, indeed, to be forbidden the exercise of our most purifying feelings because others have perverted them.

These instances may serve as illustrations of a contrast between the Prayer Book and our common mode of dealing with it, which might be carried very far. The Prayer Book recognizes in its rubrics a state of excommunication, in its prayers absolution, the bishop's power of ordination, and, last and greatest, the mystical virtue of the Sacraments. These doctrines have lain, like seeds, in our Ritual unexpanded and undwelt on, till we have too generally forgotten that they are living truths. Some fret under them and wish them altered; others modify and explain them away, as unconnected anomalies. And even of those who hold them dear, too many treat them like deep questions fit only for learned discussion, not as expressions of what should be the habitual energies of the Church; the natural exercise of those unearthly powers which Christ has entrusted to her who, in words which we should tremble to use if they were not in Scripture, "is His body, the fulness of Him who filleth all in all." Surely those scattered words have yet their destinies to fulfil, and when the Church will but give them breath, will awaken and concentrate, as they have

done in worse times, energies and talents and holiness, that the rulers of earth little think of.

The volume before us touches the magic keys with a bold hand, and though some of the notes which come forth are rather startling, and may be untruly struck, yet there is a meaning in them which deserves to be analysed by those defenders of the English Church who are looking about for weapons to wield, and ground to stand on.

Two principal wants then the author seems to have felt in the English Church—authority and richness; and that not in the spirit of a dreaming philosopher, but of one who knew that we were here not to think only, but to act; that evil was given us that we might strive against it, truth that we might uphold or restore it, revelation and moral instincts that we might know both one and the other, talent and energy, that we might form projects, recommend and execute them. Nor would the restraints he set on his impulses to influence others, till circumstances and a conscious fitness should call him to it, make him likely to shrink from his task when he felt it given him. He seems early to have thought that his powers would enable him to serve the Church more effectually as a reader and writer, than as a parochial clergyman: by acting on those minds which are to guide the masses, than on the masses themselves. To this his position as College Fellow, seemed also to invite him; and the following extracts illustrate part of the spirit in which he devoted himself to this task, and the tastes he sacrificed to it.

“*July 27, 1827.*—What is home, you silly, silly, wight,
That it seems to you to shine so bright?
What is home?—’Tis a place so gay,
Where the birds are singing all the day;
Where a wood is close by, and a river dear,
And the banks they sleep in the water clear;
Where the roses are red and the lilies pale,
And the little brooks run along every vale.
Is it no where but home, you silly-billee,
That the thrushes sing in each shady tree?
That the woods are deep, and the rivers too,
And the roses and lilies laugh at you?
O there are thousands of places as well,
So be quiet, I pray, and no nonsense tell.
Oh yes, but faces of kindness are there,
Which brighten the flowers and freshen the air;
Sweetly at morn our eyes do rest
On those whom waking thoughts have blest,
And, guarded in sleep by a magic spell,
O’er which ‘Good nights’ are sentinel.

Is then kindness so dainty a flower,
That it grows alone in one chosen bower?
Hast thou not many a brother dear,
With thee to hope, and with thee to fear?
Owning a common Father's aid,
Resting alike in a common shade?

Yes, friends may be kind, and vales may be green,
And brooks may sparkle along between;
But it is not Friendship's kindest look,
Nor loveliest vale, nor clearest brook,
That can tell the tale which is written for me
On each old face and well-known tree."

"*July 28.*—This stagnant effusion was enough for one day, and I must not put off any longer," &c.—p. 215.

"*Sept. 9, 1832.*—Also I am getting to be a sawney and not to like the dreary prospects which you and I have proposed to ourselves. But this is only a feeling; depend upon it, I will not shrink, if I buy my constancy at the expense of a permanent separation from home."

"*Sept. 27.*—As to my sawney feelings, I own that home does make me a sawney, and that the first eclogue runs in my head absurdly; but there is more in the prospect of becoming an ecclesiastical agitator, than in—"at nos hinc alii," &c.—p. 258.

And this introduces us to a side of his character, on which we have as yet scarcely touched—the fertility, buoyancy, boldness, and versatility of his mind. It has been left unnoticed, partly because no one who was ever so little acquainted with the author, or who would read ever so cursorily the book before us, could well overlook it, partly because the peculiarities on which we have dwelt seem to have exercised a far deeper influence in making him what he was. Both the *Journal* and the *Occasional Thoughts*, though principally interesting as showing the processes by which his character and opinions formed themselves, and the depth of thought and determination of purpose on which they were based, cannot but in part show those too; but in the *Letters* we are flooded with the pointed suggestions, the bold historical views of a keen-sighted politician, the vigorous statements and earnest queries of one who was seeking and contending for divine truth, and the ingenious hints, on questions of taste or science, of a man of genius who thought nothing unworthy to employ his powers which could be pressed into the service of religion. It is hardly in the nature of extracts to show this adequately, but we should be giving a very one-sided view of the author's character, if we did not give one or two examples of what he was to his friends, with which we shall close our extracts.

"*Dec. 6, 1825.*—'Sir, my dear friend,' you cannot tell how much I am obliged to you for your benevolence to my last letter, but

that does not make me the less a fool for having expressed myself so ; and what provokes me most of all is, that I did not give myself fair play by not writing till my opinions had settled ; for as far as my memory goes, I think they are now undergoing a revolution, and that if I were to see the poetry in question again, I should think quite differently of it. There is something about them which leaves (to use the words of our friend Tom Moore)

‘ A sad remembrance fondly kept
When all lighter thoughts are faded.’

And though I cannot account for the fact, I have been much more sensible of this since a reperusal of Genesis.

“ I wrote the foregoing not long after the receipt of your letter, but have been such a dandle, that I have not been able to collect materials for finishing it : and the circumstance which now at last helps me out is a melancholy one, no other than the decease of our friend and companion *Johnny Raw* : who was taken off some days since in the staggers. There was something peculiarly doleful in the poor fellow's exit ; and there was a sort of dreariness diffused over all its circumstances, which set it off with almost a theatrical effect. As B. says, it would have not been so much if he had wasted away by a long illness, or if we had heard of his death at a distance ; but to have been using and admiring him till within a few days of his decease, to have watched all the stages of his rapid illness, seen him bled, given him his physic, which seemed to distress him very much, though all the pain he suffered was evidently very great ; and, after all, to have got up at two o'clock in the night, when the crisis was to take place, and come into the stable only a minute after his death, where we could just see him, by lantern light, stretched out on the straw :—were incidents not calculated to excite pleasure. Add to this, it was one of those shivering cold stormy nights which make me feel as if I and the people with me were the only human beings in the world : a fact, by the by, which I am not yet sufficient psychologist to account for. And the next day, when we went out to bury him, the weather was just the same, and there was nothing to excite one cheerful association. Also it was somewhat staggering to the speculatively inclined, not to be able to discover one single reason why he should not be able to gallop about as well as ever. He was evidently in good condition, his flesh hard, and his limbs sound,—and why I should be able to walk any better than he was more than I could elicit. We buried him under an elm tree in the lawn, and nailed his shoes to it for a monument.

“ The last Quarterly has just . . . been put into my hands, and seeing an article on Milton's newly published affair, . . . I looked greedily for a final demolisher to his fame. Guess my horror at finding him *in limine* styled ‘ the great religious poet of the Christian world.’ I did not expect this from the worthy editor, *ἄλλως τε καὶ*, who had admitted into his last number an expression equivalent to this, that ‘ considering the wretched *ἦθος* that developed itself in every part of his compositions, it was to be regretted that even a person of Milton's talent

should have undertaken a religious subject.' You will find this in an article on Sacred Poetry. I was so disgusted at this gross inconsistency, which was even aggravated by subsequent expressions, that I could not read it through."—pp. 186—188.

The next letter is written nine years later, from Barbadoes, where the author was staying for his health; part of it is very characteristic of the author's light and playful mode of treating his own serious feelings and purposes. The letters immediately before and after it in the volume, complain with some reproachfulness, of not having heard of his Oxford friends for near a year.

"October, 1834.—I wish I knew Horace's receipt for giving the sound of a swan to mute fishes, and I most certainly should administer you a dose. I know you must have a great deal on your hands, so I should be contented with extracting only two pages in as big a hand as an idle undergraduate's theme: but I really do wish to hear something of you. . . . Concerning your worship's self, I have been able to collect that you were in existence on or about the 12th of June last. . . .

"——'s death was a great surprise to me, and I may almost say a shock, as I had always looked to him to do something great for us. . . . Do you know I partly fear that you and —— and —— are going to back out of the conspiracy, and leave me and —— to our fate. I mean to ally myself to him in a close league, and put as much mischief into his head as I can. He has sent me a great many of his pamphlets, &c., which I admire greatly for their *ῥῆθος* and execution; and I have written back to him, pointing out wherein I think him too conservative.

"I have written to —— by this post, telling how I am, i. e. much as I have been for the last six months; so I shall not go into details over again. I really think this illness is being a good thing for me; to be out of the way of excitement does more good to myself than I could do to others by being in it; and I don't know that it does one any harm to have the impression brought seriously before one, that one is not to see out the changes which seem to be at hand. I don't think I have any good ground for apprehension; but it sometimes comes into my head that . . . the pertinacity of my trifling disorder looks as if I had not much stamina left."—pp. 377, 378.

From what has been already said, some general notion may be gained of the author's formal opinions. It may be added, that he was one of those who, feeling strongly the inadequacy of their own intellects to guide them to religious truth, are prepared to throw themselves unreservedly on Revelation wherever found, in Scripture or Antiquity. Any more definite account it would be difficult to give without unfairness either to the author or to the reader; to the reader, if we omitted his more startling views; to the author, if we stated them detached and unsupported. His letters seem to show that his opinions ran somewhat in advance of those to whom he was most closely bound, still less should we

venture to pledge ourselves to every statement and suggestion contained in the two volumes; yet we cannot but express our hope that they will be very generally read and weighed, as likely to suggest thoughts on doctrine, on Church policy, and on individual conduct, most true, and most necessary for these times.

The respite from vigorous attack, which the Church seems likely, under the shadow of Conservatism, to enjoy, seems like an appointed season for looking over our armouries, adjusting our position, and throwing out fresh defences in place of those political ones which the last flood has swept away. And a thoughtful person who will fairly consider, on the one hand, the increasing importance of liberal movements for the last 150 years, the accidents (if we may call them so) which have concurred to produce the present conservative reaction, and the character of many who for the moment are swelling the cry of "the Church is in danger;" on the other, the spirit of eager inquiry on religious subjects, of anxiety to improve our fellow men, and strengthen the Church's hands, which certainly is now abroad, will hardly say that we have much time to lose, or that it is unseasonable to call attention to such a bold and comprehensive sketch for a new position as is in this book presented to him.

ART. XII.—*Travels in Crete*. By R. Pashley, Esq., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. 2 vols. Cambridge, at the Pitt Press, J. W. Parker, Printer to the University. 1837.

MR. Pashley's preface informs us that he "spent the spring and summer of the year 1833 in the Ionian islands, Albania and Greece; its autumn in some of the north-western parts of Asia Minor and at Constantinople; and the two following months at Malta." In February, 1834, he visited Crete, where he remained until the beginning of September. When he set his foot on its shores he was qualified far beyond the ordinary run of travellers, by his acquaintance both with the ancient literature of Greece, and with its modern language; and his, accordingly, is no ordinary book of travels. He seems to have prepared himself by arranging almost every scattered remnant of information which antiquity affords on the subject of Cretan geography, and his diligence was rewarded with discoveries so numerous, that future writers will probably draw more largely from his stores than from those of any other modern traveller. Of this the reader may satisfy himself by a comparison of his map with those of former geographers, while a more minute examination will, we think, prove that it

excels in accuracy no less than in fulness. As an example, we would refer our readers to the argument by which he establishes the site which he assigns (against former authorities) to the ancient city of Aptera.

Many interesting historical fragments are interspersed. Mr. Pashley devoted some time, on his homeward route, to the libraries of Venice; and melancholy indeed is his confirmation of the thrice-told tale of her colonial oppression.* Subsequent events however have effaced the memory of Venetian misrule. The deluge of the Ottoman armies has swept over this devoted island, and our author states it as an admitted fact, that for a century and a half it was oppressed beyond the experience of any other Turkish province. And yet, going on from bad to worse, the unexampled misery of the revolutionary war has taught the Cretan peasant to designate the period of Turkish tyranny as "the good old time."† There is little reason to hope that the tragedy is even yet concluded. Without entering into the prospects of the Greek nation at large, we can anticipate little good for Crete, which, after having been left to achieve its own liberation, unaided by European arms, has been consigned by European diplomacy to the iron grasp of the Egyptian Pasha—a man, civilized indeed, if the love of steam, and factories, and European military tactics, be civilization: but in every just sense of the word, as Crete has already bitterly experienced, a most heartless barbarian. We view this subject with a melancholy interest, which we cannot but feel in all that regards the prospects of a nation to which we are bound by ties not earthly but heavenly, as to our brethren in the Church Catholic, our "companions in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ."

Whatever may be to follow, the iron has already entered deeply into their soul. Whole villages of widows and children, without one adult male inhabitant—large districts, naturally rich, and lately cultivated, but now desolate wastes—such are the physical effects of the war. And yet this is the least part of the actual evil. The moral effect of such a contest on the survivors, both Christian and Mahometan—this is a calamity to be estimated by those alone who have entered into the full meaning of the Divine sentence, that "blood defileth the land," and who have read in the history of the world the effects of national sin in national degradation. As an illustration, we extract an average example of the manner in which both parties prosecuted the war.

"My (Christian) host here said, that 'two or three days after their

* It is painful to learn that Father Paul represents these abuses as a laudable trait colonial policy.—See vol. ii. p. 297.

† Τὸν καλὸν καιρὸν.

great victory, a Mohammedan came here and fell on his knees, a few paces from my door, imploring a draught of water.' 'And what did you do?' 'I took my tufek (*i. e.* musket) and shot him.'—vol. ii. p. 174.

On the other hand, we are told, that long before this event, and in fact as soon as the news of the Greek insurrection on the continent had reached Crete, which was then tranquil, a party of Mahometans surprised the peaceful inhabitants of a Christian village in church on the morning of Good Friday, and shot all the men, with the exception of one or two who effected their escape. Such was war between the Greeks and Turks of Crete.

Justice demanded the acknowledgment of Mr. Pashley's learning, and his historical and antiquarian researches. We shall say no more, however, on subjects so little connected with our peculiar province, and shall only express in passing our surprise that so learned a writer should adopt a style of pedantry which we are wont to find only in such as have picked up a few Greek words, and are resolved to make the most of them. If he had thought fit to compose his work in Greek, whether ancient or modern, no one of course could have questioned his right as a freeborn Englishman, but having waived this right and adopted the vulgar tongue, what does he gain by writing Zeus, Hephaistos, Aléxandros, Dhemetrio, and Manulios, or yet more uncouth expressions, as the convent of Haghiá Triadhá, the church of Hágghios Gheórgghios, and, most absurd of all, a "pyrgo" for a tower, an "anagnostes" for a reader, and "Hágghio Pavlo" for St. Paul?

Beyond the mere details of facts, Mr. Pashley has given us nothing of interest. It may seem almost incredible, but it is literally true, that no one glowing imagination, no one thought more suited to the soil of Greece than to the marshes of the Isle of Ely, seems to have been kindled in his mind, either by the natural beauties or by the recollections, mythological, historical, or ecclesiastical, of this most interesting island. This is no slight loss to the reader, because such subjects can be treated aright only by a mind capable of sympathy with them. The impression which they produce through the medium of a mind which delights chiefly in gross and sensual images, and receives with a sneer all that is severe and exalted, is as far from the truth, as when the imagination of a more congenial observer has invested them with a glow not their own, but borrowed from the sunshine of his own breast. Accordingly, the reader must expect to find in these volumes, not the imaginative creations of antiquity, nor the actors on the scene of history, sacred or profane, but the projection cast by these objects on the dead level of the author's mind. Still, although utterly disqualified to elevate and refine the mind of his readers by communicating his own impressions,

Mr. Pashley is, unfortunately, by no means contented to confine himself to the region in which he might be useful, as a collector of facts. A very large portion of his work is occupied by protracted discussions on the religion and superstitions of the Greek and Turkish population, which serve him as an occasion for telling us all that he has ever heard or read apparently on these subjects in every country and every age.* It is unfortunate that he should have had no friend to suggest that an author does not always shine most in treating the subjects which he chiefly delights to handle. Circumstances, it seems, compelled him to shorten the original plan of his work; and he has done it by omitting altogether his account of a very large portion of the island, including a great number of those sites where his map indicates the existence of ancient ruins; but he retains with scrupulous care his numberless discussions, which are for the most part tedious, foolish, and grossly unbecoming, and in general wholly unconnected with his subject.

It is specially to be lamented that our author should thus have enlarged upon religious questions, because it is but too evident, that he left England as ill prepared to estimate them aright as he was well furnished with classical and geographical knowledge. The benefit to be derived from foreign travel is allowed to depend chiefly on the employment of time at home, and Mr. Pashley, both in his merits and his defects, strikingly exemplifies the remark. If he had carried with him only a schoolboy's stock of classical knowledge, and more especially, if he had added an overweening confidence in his own attainments, and an ignorant and vulgar contempt of ancient literature and art, his remarks on these subjects would have possessed small value, and yet he was less qualified, both morally and intellectually, to conduct researches into church matters, than most school-boys to investigate ancient ruins and inscriptions.

It is probably in great measure this want of qualification which leads him to assume the air of an infallible judge in controversies of both faith and practice. The following extract will afford some indication of his manner.

“In Spain,” he tells us, “(after the Saracen conquest) the apostacy

* In reading Mr. Pashley's sneers against Oriental Christians, it is difficult not to imagine that he intends his ridicule to reach others not mentioned, but with whom his readers would naturally be more familiar. We were strongly reminded of the exquisite satire of Swift, in his “Abstract of Mr. Collins's Discourse.” “Cicero was so noble a free-thinker that he believed nothing at all of the matter, nor even shows the least inclination to favour superstition, or the belief of a God, and the immortality of the soul; unless what he throws out sometimes to save himself from danger, in his speeches to the Roman mob, whose religion was, however, much more innocent and less absurd than that of Popery at least; and I could say more—but you understand me.”

soon became general, though* for a while longer members of the sacerdotal order were still found who professed Christianity, using, however, the *Mozarabic* Liturgy, and, like many of the so-called Christians of their day, conforming to the most important ceremonial observances of Islamism."—vol. i. p. 104.

It is plain enough (though ingenuity may very likely explain it otherwise), that the author imagined that the *Mozarabic* Liturgy, the use of which he cites in italics as a proof of demi-apostacy, was either of Arabian origin, or at least so tinged with Arabian rites, as to belong rather to Islamism than to the Gospel. Now what are the facts? It is none other than the ancient Liturgy of the Spanish Church, and is known to have been in use at least very long before the birth of Mahomet. How much greater its antiquity may be, there is no occasion to examine at large; suffice it to say that many, and those the most competent judges, have identified it with the form provided for the use of the Ephesian Church by the beloved Apostle St. John; and in the opinion of one who had obviously devoted profound attention to the subject, "it may perhaps be said without exaggeration that, next to the Holy Scriptures," this with three other Liturgies of similar antiquity, possesses "the greatest claims on our veneration and study."—Such is the Liturgy which our author (misled apparently by its name), supposes to afford proof of the apostacy of those who adhered to it; and such the Divine, whose "ipse dixit" is to be our authority on intricate theological questions.†

It is one of these questions, whether or not the Greek Church acknowledges the dogma of Transubstantiation; a controversy of considerable moment, for if this be a new and strange doctrine to the Greek Christians, it can be no Catholic tradition, but at best

* Mr. Pashley's expression is ambiguous, but implied that they were found only "for a while." For this insinuation there is not the slightest colour. Spain was conquered A.D. 711. In a note of Gibbon, vol. ix. chap. 41, he mentions the translation of the canons into Arabic in A.D. 1039, "a while later," "for the use of the bishops and clergy in the Moorish kingdoms," a fact which proves that they held their paternal faith with a firmer grasp than their mother tongue.

† The reader will find a full account of this subject in Mr. Palmer's invaluable *Origines Liturgicæ*, vol. i. sect. ix. and x. The history of this ancient Liturgy as recorded by Mr. Palmer, is remarkable. It is found in very early times in the churches in the South of France, whither it appears to have been brought by the Oriental missionaries, by whom the Church of Lyons was founded. Here it prevailed till the age of Charlemagne, when it was supplanted by the Roman form. Meanwhile however, an offshoot of the Gallic Church had taken root in Spain, where its Liturgy continued in use till near the end of the eleventh century, when, by the Papal interest, the Roman rite now prevailing there was substituted for it. Yet at that very era, it was pronounced to be orthodox by an Italian council, that of Mantua, A.D. 1064: and it was so highly valued by the great Ximenes, that he founded a college and chapel to perpetuate its use, which, so far as we know, is maintained there to this day.

Some very interesting observations on this subject will be found in the *Tracts for the Times*, vol. 3, no. 65.

a private opinion of the Roman Church. We expect to see our author quoted by Romanists as a learned Protestant authority: for he not only concedes to the Latin Church their monstrous usurpation of the exclusive right to the Catholic* name, but pronounces *ex cathedrâ* the Catholicity of the doctrine in question, chiefly as it appears on the authority of a blasphemy which he heard from a drunken Turk (vol. i. p. 316), no unfit witness unquestionably in any theological controversy whereon Mr. Pashley was qualified to sit as judge. As, however, some readers may be disposed to impugn alike the authority of the judge and the credibility of his witness, they will not, we think, complain if we transcribe the opinion delivered in this matter by another English layman, who deemed it worthy of more serious inquiry, and whose conclusion is somewhat different.

“It hath been,” says Ricault, (in his “Present State of the Greek Church, A.D. 1678”), “a question very dubitable, and not meanly controverted, what side the Greek Church hath maintained in this dispute. For if you will believe Cyrillus, the Patriarch of Constantinople, in the 17th article of his confession of faith, wrote about the year 1630, and printed 1633, his sense and words are wholly agreeable to the tenets of the reformed churches in this particular; from which those whose education is purely of the Greek literature, instructed and taught in their own monasteries, do not seem much to deviate; for when they carry this Sacrament to the sick, they do not prostrate themselves before it, nor do they expose it publicly to be adored, unless in the very act of administration; nor do they carry it in procession, nor have they instituted any particular feast in honour of it, all which are arguments, that had this belief of Transubstantiation been agreeable to the faith of the ancient eastern councils, they would not have been less careful in ordaining those particular notes of honour in the administration than the Western have done. However, such as have had their education in Italy, as he who wrote the Oriental confession, together with those who subscribed it, seemed to concur wholly with the Church of Rome in this tenet, ‘Ὁ πᾶς ὁ ἱερεὺς ἀγιάζει τὰ δῶρα, ἡ αὐτὴ οὐσία τοῦ ἄρτου, καὶ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ οἴνου, μεταβάλλεται εἰς τὴν οὐσίαν τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ: that is, When the priest consecrates the elements, the very substance of the bread and wine is transformed into the true substance of the body and blood of Christ. And a little farther they proceed in these words: ἡ μετουσίωσις παρευδὺς γίνεται, καὶ ἀλλήσῃ ὁ

* It is probable that he had always been wont to apply this name to the Romanists in England and elsewhere, in itself no proof of his fitness to write on the subjects which he has ventured to handle. But he should at least have conceded to the Greeks the name which they universally claim, even if in his mind Catholic be so opposed to Protestant, as to mean “unreformed,” for when was the Greek reformation?

ἄρτος εἰς τὸ ἀληθινὸν σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ὁ οἶνος εἰς τὸ ἀληθινὸν αἷμα ἀπομένονται μόνον τὰ εἶδη ὁποῦ φαίνονται, καὶ τοῦτο κατὰ τὴν θείαν εἰκονίαν; by which we perceive that the Greeks have lately formed a word, which is μεταστώσις, to signify or express Transubstantiation, which they never read in their ancient fathers; though they found it metaphorically used in some times before the words μεταβολή and μεταστοιχείωσις. * * * Nor is it a wonder that the Greeks follow the Latins in this doctrine, since, as we have said before, the most learned men among them taking their education in Italy, have, in all points wherein neither custom nor councils have determined, taken up their doctrine according to the positions of the Roman schools, whom therefore they name by the distinction of Λατινόφρονες. For really others which have had their education in Greece only, do not follow this novelty; and they which do, contradict their own Liturgy; viz. that of St. Chrysostom, which is common to them both, wherein after the complete consecration these words follow; ἡμᾶς δε, &c., * * that is, that all we who partake of this bread and this cup may be united together in the fellowship of the Holy Ghost," &c.—vol. ii. p. 182—185.

The true state of the case then seems to be, that Transubstantiation is no doctrine of the Greek Church, although her depressed condition has exposed her to an overflow of Papal doctrine from the West, which has infected some of her children with this novel error. Its novelty in the East nothing can more clearly indicate, than the need of translating a Latin phrase, in order to its expression, in spite of the redundant copiousness of the Greek theological vocabulary. The same circumstance, it is remarked by Hammond, * led to a similar expedient on the part of those who introduced to the Eastern Church those speculations on the Divine decrees, which, originating in St. Austin, have taken such firm root both among the Roman schoolmen and the pupils of Calvin. He says, "it is worth observing on the confession of the religion of the Greek Church, subscribed by Cyrill, the present Patriarch of Constantinople, where having somewhat to do with this phrase of God's absolute dominion, so much talked of here in the West; he is much put to it, to express it in Greek, and at last fain to do it by a word coined on purpose, a mere Latinism for the turn, ἀκαταλυσμένην κυριότητα, an expression, I think, capable of no excuse but this, that a new piece of divinity was to be content with a barbarous phrase."

Our author, we think, ought to have touched modestly on the

* See Directions for Priest and People. Sermon 2.

ological and ecclesiastical questions, were it only as belonging to a branch of study, to which he has obviously paid no attention. But we regret to add that his moral disqualifications are far more insuperable. In fact, no very ordinary qualities are requisite to the man who would estimate aright the state of foreign churches, and would so treat of them as to produce in the reader's mind a just and healthful impression. Every circumstance unites to increase the difficulty. The modern traveller leaves behind him not "the church bells of his home" alone, the house of his fathers, and the religious sympathies and associations of his youth — this alone is no small evil, yet by comparison, it is inconsiderable. The Christian world is divided against itself; the members and ministers of the church are debarred from communion by crossing a river or a mountain. One evil of this monstrous anomaly is evidently its effect on the traveller, to whom it is the source of numerous temptations, varied as are men's dispositions. A zealous and serious man is tempted to an uncharitable bigotry; to a separation in heart and affections from those who reject much which he regards as sacred, and who refuse to admit him as a brother. This evil has often prevailed in former times, and is exemplified even in the work before us, by the alienation which exists between the members of the Greek and Latin Churches. By such a spirit the union of the East and West was endangered as early as the era of Polycarp, in the course of the controversy on the Paschal season. But times are changed, and men have changed with them, and the modern English traveller is seldom to be charged with superstitious bigotry. From another danger however he is not exempt: he is not unlikely to forget altogether the sacred doctrine taught him from his infancy, the article of faith of ONE CATHOLIC AND APOSTOLIC CHURCH; he may easily adopt a spurious liberalism which regards the Church as little more than an abstract idea, and her communion as no great blessing; he may esteem religion as a matter between God and the heart of each individual;—nay, if he be not guarded by a strong religious principle beguiling him into a happy inconsistency, he may go so far as to imagine that it matters not very much of what shade be a man's faith, so that it is untainted with that worst of heresies in the estimate of a modern liberal—a bigoted attachment to his own church and creed. The end of this downward course is then at hand, and it is—absolute infidelity; an indifference to all religion as such, and a preference of one form over another, only as it interferes less with the course of the world; in other words, as it fails to be what, at her peril, the Church must ever be, a restless society, acting continually on the aggressive against men's vain

notions and corrupt practices, and bringing all things into subjection to the obedience of Christ.

And after all, and with all his liberalism, yet in one main point he resembles the veriest bigot. Each alike becomes an insulated being, separated by an impassable gulf from the religious worship and faith of the land in which he sojourns. The church bells are to him no call to devotion, the holy seasons pass by unnoticed, and the man stands aloof from a society of Christian brethren, as if he were surrounded by Mahometans or Heathens. Against these dangers it is not easy effectually to guard. Nay, it may sometimes be impossible to preserve aright the contending claims of truth and love. To honour the Roman Church and the Roman Bishop for example, without countenancing the errors of Popery, is a perplexing problem to every English Catholic at Rome; nor is the embarrassment much less in Greece and other countries. There is room for much honest doubt, and many serious questions; and our eyes ought to be open to the fact, because these questions have not unfrequently been adduced as a fatal objection against the true Catholic doctrine of the Church and Church authority. Yet, in truth, admitting all their force, why should they be so regarded? May not a Churchman confess a degree of perplexity? Nay, may he not even urge that perplexity was to be expected as the natural, the legitimate, offspring of sin? For the present condition of the Church is one of schism: and schism is sin: and sin in nations, as in individuals, is sure to beget doubt, and difficulty, and uncertainty. Men break the barriers of God's law, in hopes to simplify matters, and to find some shorter way; but soon they are bewildered and lost in a wilderness of their own choosing. So has it been here. But these perplexities are the effect only of our separations, no necessary consequence of Catholic doctrines: but the reverse. Mr. Pashley would have us believe that the fourth century was an era of corruption and bigotry: it was one, unquestionably, in which sound Church views universally prevailed—and how stood this matter then? The theory of the Church was then exhibited in operation before all the world, and men actually knew the disciples of Christ by the love that they had one toward another. Then there reigned throughout Christendom, not uniformity but unity. Like the surrounding atmosphere, the Church of God encompassed every land in one unbroken tide of blessing, but admitted variations in each, suited to the distinction of climates and the character of the inhabitants. There were various languages and customs; there were different rulers; but the Church was one, as her Lord is one; her rites were but the varying rule

of the same blessed company; her rulers every where acknowledged in their brethren the same authority which they exercised themselves. Every where was the same precious deposit, the holy apostolical tradition committed in each Church to the line of Bishops, and in every succession maintained inviolate in the creeds and mysteries of the Catholic Church. Here then was unity; but for uniformity in those lesser matters which that tradition had left undecided, or had ordered variously in the separate Churches, they contended not. When, therefore, the Christian left England for Greece, or the Roman visited the cities of Asia, he changed his language; he found some practices which were unknown to him; but he could not for a moment imagine that he had left his own Church behind him; that the rites of a foreign land were those of another society, or her Bishops and rulers no more to him than other men. For he was a Christian, and wherever the Christian went, he was a member still of the same holy city; and as in England he belonged to the English, so in Rome he was a member of the Roman, and at Ephesus of the Asiatic Church. To her rulers he owed, for a while, all loyalty and spiritual allegiance; from their hands he received the holy mysteries entrusted by the Lord to his mystical body, and derived from her to each of her faithful children. And for lesser matters, for ceremonies and rites, which varied in different lands, he had no new lesson to learn, he had ever been taught to obey in these things the laws of that Church on whose bosom he was cherished for a season.

That such was the ancient rule, is too notorious to need confirmation; but we will cite one authority, because it chances to relate to one of the questions which Mr. Pashley has handled in his usual irreverent and supercilious spirit. He tells us that "the Greek Christian is scandalized at the Latin for fasting on Friday and Saturday, while he mortifies the flesh on Wednesday and Friday," and then adds, as one of the discoveries of his foreign travels, "Wednesday was the day on which our Lord was betrayed; Friday that on which He was crucified." In this as in other parts of the work, he assumes an air not uncommon with those who love to represent it as one grand discovery of modern liberalism, that men who agree in all important matters, ought not to contend concerning trifling differences. But in truth, this has ever been a great Catholic principle, although, like others, too often drowned by the din of controversy and the violence of human passions. In illustration of our meaning, we may refer to the reply of Saint Austin to the inquiry how a Christian ought to act with regard to the religious rites of foreign Churches

which he chances to visit? He answers, first, that he must adhere to Baptism in the name of the Trinity, and to Holy Communion, and any thing else, if such there be, which is commanded in the Canonical Scriptures. Next he must observe whatever is sanctioned by the universal Church throughout all the world, as the annual observance of our Lord's birth and death and resurrection, and of the coming of the Holy Ghost; for this agreement could not have prevailed but by a command from the Apostles, or from a general council, the authority of which is most wholesome in the Church. Then he adds, "As for those things, which vary in different countries, as, for instance, that some fast on Saturday, others not, this whole class of observances is optional. Nor is there any better rule for a sober and wise Christian, than that of acting as the Church does, which he chances to visit. For whatever cannot be shown to be contrary to faith or morals, should be deemed indifferent, and observed for the sake of union with those among whom we live. I think you have heard me mention, but I will recall it to your memory, that when my mother joined me at Milan, and found that the Church did not fast on Saturday, she was at first disturbed, and perplexed what she ought to do. I did not trouble myself with such matters, but for her sake I asked counsel on this point from Ambrose of blessed memory. He replied, that he could not teach me any thing but that which he practised, because if he knew of any thing better, he should himself observe it. I suppose he meant to give no reason, but direct us, on his own simple authority, by no means to fast on Saturday. But he went on and said, 'When I go to Rome I fast on Saturday; when I am here I do not; and you too, whatever Church you chance to visit, observe its rule, as you would not scandalize another, nor have him scandalize you.'"^{*}

Here is true and enlightened liberality; as far from the sneer of a modern liberal who contemns all scrupulosity in religious questions, and makes no distinction between rites of Catholic and of local authority, because he "cares for none of these things," as from the narrow-minded bigotry which would exalt one man, or one nation, or one Church, over every other. When the members of the Church acted thus, they carried out the true Catholic rule—"in necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus charitas;" and Christendom was indeed as a city which was at unity with itself. But if men's passions have now divided it against itself; if they have invented imaginary differences, and

aggravated into schisms those which have a real existence; if novel doctrines have overlaid some Churches, and others have cast them aside, and with them a part of the deposit committed to their care, can we wonder, or shall we argue that the Catholic doctrines are not founded upon a rock, because there is some difficulty in deciding how a Christian ought to act under circumstances so disastrous?

Yet our practical difficulties surely are less than mere theorists imagine. It is plain enough, for instance, that the English Church laments all schism as a sin, and that whenever her children draw near to her holy mysteries, she teaches them to pray, "that all who do confess God's holy name may agree in the truth of His holy word, and live in unity and godly love." Thus, she holds forth the hand of fellowship to many who refuse communion with her, but whose orders and sacraments she acknowledges, because they have not erred so widely as to forfeit the name and privileges of the Church. The English Christian, then, who visits countries oppressed by Papal domination, or those of the more unhappy Greeks, is not among strangers, but among those whom, with all their errors, he recognizes as his brethren. Never can he feel or profess himself to be a mere bystander, an impartial witness of Roman, or Greek, or Mahometan superstitions. Wherever he finds Christians, and however degraded by ignorance and superstition, it is his joy to unite himself to the despised servants of his Lord. Not scornfully, but with an affectionate sympathy, will He regard their miseries, for "if one member suffer, all the members suffer with it." Upon their very offences and corruptions he looks with no hard and supercilious curiosity; for these are the shame of his brethren, the pollutions of the Temple of the Holy Ghost, the scars and wounds of the body of Christ. Rather will he mourn over them with something of that loyal and yearning reverence with which the holy women followed Him to His cross and to his tomb, and saw His sacred form scourged and pierced and crucified, and knew not as yet why these things were, but "waited, standing afar off, and beholding," until the mystery should be accomplished. In this spirit will he stand aloof from those things which are condemned by his conscience and the rules of his Church; but to every laudable or even innocent custom of his brethren around him, he will carefully conform himself. If the Greeks, for example, have left uncorrected the imperfections of the Julian calendar, and thus, by an astronomical error, observe the sacred seasons according to the old, not the new style, he will choose to adopt their practice rather than separate himself

from his Christian brethren, and act as one unconcerned in his Lord's birth, and death, and resurrection. And if the Eastern Church has forbidden to her children the use of flesh on Wednesdays and Fridays,* he will be ready, with the great Apostle of the Gentiles, rather to eat none while the world lasteth, than to outrage their best feelings, and identify himself with the infidel Turks, by a total apparent disregard of the days on which his Master was betrayed and crucified.

If, as we believe, God has raised up the English Church to reflect again to the world in these latter days, the brightness of primitive times, and of the primitive faith, we can fulfil our high destiny only by acting in the spirit here described. The English traveller cannot but be regarded as her representative. If his conduct and sentiments be those of an enlightened Catholic, the ignorant and oppressed natives will naturally lend a favourable ear when he lifts his voice against real corruptions. But if they see in him a total absence of all external religion, and if he treats that which prevails among them, as a mere heathen superstition, he enlists against him every holy and religious principle of their hearts; and what can follow, but that the English Reformation will seem to them only an out-break of infidelity,† and that Catholic faith and practice will more and more be associated with superstition and corruption.

In these remarks, we have assumed that the traveller finds himself among the members of a corrupt branch of the true Church, and that his object is to maintain and recommend to them, such a course of practice as would have been approved by its ancient worthies in purer times. But all such considerations must of course appear absurd to him who believes his own church and

* The fasts of the Greek Church are so rigidly observed in Crete, that we fear the natives, if they judge of English Christians by Mr. Pashley, will transfer to our island the stigma imposed by the Apostle on their fathers, as far, at least, as regards the epithet *ἡσυχασταί*. It is remarkable, that Ricault considers these fasts as having been one of the chief means of preserving the Greeks from apostacy.—p. 16.

† How far this may be the case already, it is well worth our while to consider. The following extract is from Ricault: The Greeks, "taking notice that the English neither keep fasts, nor practise confession, nor ordinarily make the sign of the cross; and that the Dutch nation, at Smyrna, rehearse no prayers at the burial of the dead, are not only scandalized thereat, but also Jews and Turks take offence at the silence of prayers when the dead are buried, wondering what sort of heresy or sect is sprung up in the world, so different from the religion of all the prophets. At which indecent practice, the Roman clergy taking advantage to disparage the Protestants, represent them, &c. * * * to be such as condemn all order in the Church. * * * And in reality, were it not that the English nation, by the orderly use of their Liturgy, and discipline of their Church, observing the Lord's day, and the grand festivals, did vindicate themselves of these aspersions, it were impossible to persuade the Oriental countries, that those which we call Reformed were Christians, or at least retain any thing of ancient and apostolic institution."

faith to have had their first origin at the Reformation, and that the abuses which he sees in unreformed countries, are but the remains of the primitive system, unmodified as yet by the march of improvement. In this case, he cannot claim any thing in common with foreign Christians. His Church has never had any connexion with theirs. It is by himself, and not by them, that the ancient faith has been altered.

Such, we regret to say, was the lamentable delusion under which Mr. Pashley commenced his travels, and which made it impossible for him to judge aright of the Greek Church, or her sons. He saw, in their worst corruptions, the living and exciting exhibition of the faith of their Chrysostoms, and Gregories, and Athanasiuses. And yet, even this does not satisfy him, without tracing their religion still higher. It is assumed as an axiom throughout his volumes, that the religion of Greece has continued substantially unchanged from the days of Homer to our own. To establish this monstrous absurdity, he employs that resemblance which has been supposed to exist between some modern and some ancient superstitions, and then assumes, that wherever such a resemblance, whether real or fancied, can be traced, the notion in question has been handed down in an uninterrupted course of tradition, through successive generations of idolaters, for three thousand years. In like manner, he imagines the western converts to have retained the reality of their ancient paganism, in adopting the Christian name. In England, however, this ancient faith was laid aside, it should seem, three hundred years ago; an era which, if he is consistent, he must regard as that of our national conversion from the superstition of Oden and Thor, to the religion of Christ. The folly of such an hypothesis it is needless to expose. It is needless to show, as might very easily be done, that the supposed heathen tradition was interrupted; that there was a period when the old superstitions were eradicated, while the corruptions of later days had not as yet taken root. It is needless to prove, that so long as man's nature is the same, the workings of his mind, in similar circumstances, will, in a measure, be the same likewise—that as every man does not receive from nature a temper which enables him, like Mr. Pashley, to regard all the wonders and beauties of nature as mere facts, to view them without interest or emotion, and see, in caverns like those of Crete, only so many cavities in a rock of limestone, it may chance that the admiration of very distant generations may agree in referring them to superhuman agents, without any communication from one to the other; just as we may see in Mr. Pashley many characteristics of the Sadducees of old, although

he does not follow them in any continuous school. All this childish trifling, however, we shall pass by, to speak of that which is far more important—the melancholy profaneness implied in the theory before us. The infidelity of Gibbon is never more clearly apparent than in his account of the causes of the propagation of the Gospel. Mr. Pashley's awkward conjectures must not be mentioned in connexion with the subtilties of Gibbon, but his theory as effectually degrades the religion of Christ from the rank of a Divine Revelation, conquering and to conquer by reason of its inherent authority and the promised blessing of its Author. Indeed, without addressing ourselves to estimate his actual motives, we cannot but declare that his style of writing might very well have been what it is, if it had been his deliberate purpose to undermine altogether the authority of Revelation. Christianity, he declares, failed to work its way. The philosophic pride of Athens, and the ignorant bigotry of Crete, were alike too strong for it, until it conformed itself to the prevailing polytheism, about which time, by a fortunate coincidence, the emperors compelled their unwilling subjects to adopt the Christian profession, and to substitute the names of the saints for those of their heathen deities. The mongrel religion, thus compounded, he supposes to have come down unchanged to our own day.

And can a Christian be quick to believe that such was indeed the triumph of the cross? Was it for this that Christ died, and rose, and revived, that men should call themselves Christians by compulsion; and then retain for fifteen hundred years in the bosom of His Church their heathen gods, and worship, and superstition? If it was by blood that the church was cemented, it was by the blood, not of her enemies, but of her sons. The foolish things of the world were chosen by God to confound the wise, and the weak things of the world to confound the strong. In the words of Jeremy Taylor, “for three hundred years the Church lived upon blood, and was nourished with blood; the blood of her own children. * * * * The cause of Christ and religion was advanced by the sword, but it was the sword of the persecutors, not of resisters or warriors. They were all baptized unto the death of Christ; their very profession and institution is to live like Him, and when He requires it, to die for Him; that is the very formality, the life and essence of Christianity. This, I say, lasted for three hundred years; that the prayers, and the back, and the necks of Christians, fought against the rods and axes of the persecutors, and prevailed; till the country, and the cities, and the court itself, was filled with Christians. And by this time the army of martyrs was vast and numerous, and the

multitude of sufferers blunted the hangman's sword. For Christ first triumphed over the princes and powers of the world, before He would permit them to serve Him; He first felt their malice, before He would make use of their defence; to show that it was not His necessity that required, but His grace that admitted, kings and queens to be nurses of the Church."*

Let us now contrast with these words wherein a Christian celebrates the victory of His Lord against that world over which He triumphed by His cross, with these in which Mr. Pashley expresses his own theory; he writes in the following strain:—

"The legal establishment of Christianity as the paid religion of the state did but little in Greece towards extinguishing the ancient superstition.* * * We find that the Cretans continued to worship the old deities of their island, and to venerate the tomb of Zeus half a century after this legal establishment of Christianity throughout the empire. It was only when the Spaniard Theodosius made himself the blind instrument of orthodox fanatics, and annexed the severest penalties to the celebration of the sacrifices and ceremonies of the old religion, that the corrupted Christianity of the fourth century prevailed. * * It seems as if the pomps and glories of the old religion retained for nearly four centuries after the Christian era an unrelaxed hold on the conviction and affections of the Cretan people, notwithstanding the labours of Titus and the elders whom he established among them. And it does not surprise us that Christianity should have failed to take root suddenly and deeply in a mountainous country like Crete," &c.—vol. i. pp. 214, 215.

Again, we have the following classical and grammatical sentence:—

"No educated traveller can fail to notice the identity between many of the superstitions equally prevalent among both ancient and modern inhabitants of various parts of Greece. It is manifest that beings, created by the lively imagination of the Greeks in olden times, are still objects of veneration at the present day," &c.—vol. i. p. 289.

Again:—

"Great Britain, while the mythology of modern Rome engrafted on old Pagan superstitions formed an essential part of her religious creed, had many such holy wells."—p. 90.

Again:—

"Such natural temples are chiefly appropriated at the present day, not like this fountain near Polis to the old divinities [i. e. the nymphs] under new names, but to the virgin queen of Heaven, whom the modern mythology describes," &c.—p. 92.

"I suppose these notions to be vestiges of opinions once inculcated

* Sermon ix. On the Faith and Patience of the Saints. Hebr. v. 534.

by the Fathers of the Church respecting the Pagan water-spirits, which till they received as it were Christian baptism, and the name of a saint, were naturally treated as demoniacal beings."—p. 94.

It is a fair illustration of Mr. Pashley's manner of writing travels, to observe that the lengthened dissertation on the identity of Christianity and heathen superstition, from which we have made these extracts, and which fills seven octavo pages, is connected with his travels merely by the fact that he passed

"the Church of Haghiæ Parthénœ, of which my guide speaks with deep feelings of religious respect; and an hundred paces farther, a most copious fountain deriving its name from the same holy and miracle-working virgin's to whom the Church is dedicated, and who also presides over the waters."—p. 88.

It is no great marvel that our traveller, who thus conceived himself to be sojourning, not among Christians, members of an ancient, though corrupted Church, but among the worshippers of the idols of ancient Greece, should have felt no greater sympathy with the so-called Christians or their creed than with the Mahometans or the literal heathens of old times. Accordingly it would be hard indeed to say whom he most favours. He notices the superstitions, the worship, the festivals of all with impartial superciliousness. The Bairam of the Turks, the Easter of the Greeks, and the festivals of the heathen, are alike indifferent to him. Of the former he writes:—

"This festival is called by the Turks the feast of sacrifices, or the feast of the Khadgis, or pilgrims. The origin of both appellations is explained by the fact that on the day of its commencement these *holy* men slay victims as the last religious act of their pilgrimage to Mecca."—vol. ii. p. 22.

Of the Christian bishops he says—

"These oriental ecclesiastics have certainly outstripped their western brethren in loudsounding and pompous appellations, as much as they have fallen short of them in the enjoyment of the more substantial benefits, both of a well-paid establishment and of temporal power. Every Greek bishop, though in a mere worldly view sometimes little removed from the condition of Paul and the apostles, the labour of whose hands ministered to their daily necessities, yet enjoys the title of His *Holiness*, which at Rome contents even the successor of St. Peter. The Patriarch of Constantinople must of course be of superior sanctity to a common bishop, and is therefore addressed as His *All Holiness*. What the peculiar *holiness* of these mitred dignitaries under the sun of Greece really is, may be easily conjectured when it is known that they are *monks*."—vol. ii. p. 188.

Of the heathen—

"The *pious* heathen of ancient times who believed certain sacred but

inanimate things to have travelled from the land of the Hyperboreans to Delos, thought it necessary to provide them with a human escort for their long and tedious journey; but the oriental Christian both a few centuries ago and at the present day, in his unlimited faith and credulity needs no such aids."—vol. ii. p. 192.

Again:—

"We need hardly wonder that in this island, the credulity and superstition of the Mohammedans should closely resemble those of the Christian population."—vol. ii. p. 194.

Let it be remembered that this impartial tone is adopted by a Christian in comparing Mahometans with Christians, the blasphemers and persecutors of Christ, with those who, even to the death, have confessed his name. Mr. Pashley himself tells us elsewhere concerning these heathen-Christians.

"It should never be forgotten that any Christian prisoner, instead of becoming a martyr, might throughout the war have saved his life by embracing Mohammedanism."—vol. i. p. 107.

He supplies us too with the following example of faithful martyrdom:—

"In the year 1824, three Kurmélidbes, two brothers and one of their cousins, were executed outside the walls of Rhithymnos. * * The men were brought before the Bey at his palace within the city; he offered them their lives on condition of their abandoning their religion. The proposal was instantly and indignantly rejected by the eldest of the prisoners. On this they were conducted to the place of execution near the Turkish cemetery without the walls. When every thing was ready, the Bey again asked the eldest whether he would become a Mohammedan. No, his faith was firm, he replied 'I was born a Christian, and a Christian I will die;' and in an instant his two companions saw his head severed from his body. The second, nothing shaken in his resolution by the sight, when asked to choose between the Crescent and the axe, answered that he would follow his brother, and on this he also was beheaded. The cousin of these two sufferers was very young, and though firm of purpose was unable to make any answer when the same proposal was repeated to him. He was seized by the attendants, and the next moment his body likewise was a headless bleeding trunk. The Bishop of Rhithymnos went near the spot that night and also the two next evenings. Each time he saw a light descend on the bodies of the two who with so holy and fervent a zeal had earned the crown of martyrdom. The blood-stained clothes of all the three unfortunates were cut off and distributed; a very small portion of them, if burnt in a sick chamber, used to effect the invalid's immediate restoration to health."—vol. i. p. 107.

It was for the sake of this last sentence, it should seem, that the anecdote has been given us; and yet in right reason which is most pitiable, the man who dies for the name of Christ, or the Christian who in such a tone relates his martyrdom?

He is equally elevated above the disputes of Catholics and heretics.

"This word Θεοτόκος was the chief stumbling-block in the way of the unfortunate Nestorius, who thought the word Χριστοτόκος or 'Mother of Christ,' sufficiently expressive of the peculiar relation which she bore to the Deity. The orthodoxy of the day, however, thought it right to excommunicate and anathematize the so-called heretic, who consequently became the founder of a sect which was diffused from China to Jerusalem and Cyprus, and the numbers of which are said with those of the Jacobites to have once surpassed the Greek and Latin communions."—vol. i. p. 192, note.

All this is very lamentable; for it is not possible that he, who thus feels and writes, should continue to regard the Church and Faith of Christ as the ark in which his own soul must be saved; and in the end he is but too sure to lose his reverence even for those things which he still professes to honour; the word of God and its Divine Author.

How far Mr. Pashley has escaped, let the following extracts tell. The first shows the sense in which he uses the word philosophical; as synonymous with infidel:—

"These legends are entitled to about as much credit as the better-known falsehood respecting Pilate's letter to Tiberius, which is equally rejected by the philosophical historian (Gibbon, ch. xvi.), and the orthodox divine (Bishop Kaye)."—i. p. 6.

Again,—“This ignorant or philosophical Turk.” The alternative is observable; if the man violated the rules which he professed to believe divine, because he knew them not, he was only ignorant; but, if he outraged them knowingly and willingly, he attains the rank of a philosopher. To which class does Mr. Pashley desire to be referred? If religious ignorance be inconsistent with philosophy, he must obviously resign his pretensions; but if, as we may imagine, a superabundant measure of profaneness will compensate for lack of knowledge, few have a better claim. It would be bigoted, surely, and unbecoming the liberality of the age, to refuse the palm of (minute) philosophy to those of whom St. Jude writes, “These speak evil of those things which they know not, and what they know naturally, as brute beasts, in those things they corrupt themselves.”

Again,

“My hostess here, at Anópolis, was once traversing the mountains, accompanied by one of her daughters, and when about three miles from the village of Muri, they heard sounds, as of voices singing”—[this being followed by stones, she]—“immediately pronounced aloud some holy texts, which are a never-failing charm against any common demon. When she found that the evil spirit still continued to sing, and to cast

stones at them, she knew it must be a Katakhanas (i. e. vampire), and, therefore, crossing herself, and calling on the Holy Mother of God, she immediately repeated, 'In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and the word was God.' * * She next repeated a part of the Greek ritual, which produced no better effect. An ancient Cretan, under the same circumstances, would probably have called on as many names as were invoked by the old lady. Instead of the Panaghia, the Logos, and the Angels, he would have used the celebrated Ephesian words, or the names of the Idean Dactyls," &c.—vol. ii. 219, 220.

Some former travellers mention an inscription, found in Crete, directing the worshippers to uncover their feet. Mr. Pashley remarks,—“A similar feeling prevailed among the Jews (Exodus, iii. 5; John, v. 15; Acts, vii. 33), and with the Pythagoreans.” It should seem that Mr. Pashley feared lest, in classing the feeling of the Jews between that of the Pythagoreans and the simple heathen, he should be thought to be “ignorant,” that “the Lord called unto Moses, put off thy shoes from off thy feet;” but, by referring to the text, he proves it to be a stroke of his “philosophy.”

The Kurmelis, who are the heroes of the next extract, were a powerful Christian family, which, for several generations, had made an external profession of Islamism.

“Still, now and then, fears would arise in the breast of each Kurmúlis, respecting his prospects with reference to the other world; and, at length, one of them determined to make a pilgrimage to the Holy Sepulchre, and to ask the Bishop there, whether a sincere Christian, who professed Islamism, and was supposed to be a true believer in it, could be saved. The Bishop sternly answered, that any Christian, who shunned the open profession of his faith, had no chance of salvation; and on this, the old man immediately took a resolution, which was immediately adopted by nearly half the members of the clan. Thirty Kurmúlidhes determined to go at once to the Pasha at the Kastron, to confess that they were Christians, and to endure the ignominious death which would immediately await them. On their arrival in the city, out of respect for the Archbishop, they went to his residence, ‘the metropolis,’ before presenting themselves at the ‘seraglio’ of the Pasha. The Metropolitan, on learning their intention, naturally saw the question in a very different light from the Bishop at Jerusalem, and remonstrated with them, in strong and energetic terms, against their design. He easily showed them, that it was not only their own martyrdom on which they had determined, but that of many others, whom they would leave behind them. * * * The Archbishop likewise alluded to the use they had ever made of their power to protect their Christian brethren, and ended by assuring them, that he differed from the Bishop at Jerusalem, and believed that they might go to heaven, though they lived and died in ostensible communion with the followers of Mohammed. His

arguments and exhortations at length prevailed, and they consented to leave the city, without divulging their secret to the Pasha."—vol. i. p. 105—107.

Alas! how shall the author escape the woe pronounced on those who call evil good, and good evil, by Him who has declared, "Whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven."

He tells us again, that "the well-known Roman practice of putting certain classes of culprits to death, by impaling or crucifixion, was abolished by Constantine, not, as it seems, from motives of humanity, but from a superstitious reverence, manifested in many acts of his life, for the form of the cross." That is, it is a superstition, in the judgment of a modern philosopher, that a Christian should feel pain in the thought, that the peculiar death to which his Lord humbled himself, for his sake, should be reserved by the law as the last punishment of the vilest slaves and gladiators, the refuse of society.

Mr. Pashley was in Crete at the season of our blessed Lord's death and Resurrection, according to the old style of the Greeks, and the new style of the Western Church. The former he notices, by mentioning incidentally, "it is now the great week of the Greeks," as if the remembrance of their Lord's passion were some mere Greek superstition.* Easter day he dignifies with another tedious dissertation, on the similarity of Greek and Turkish superstitions, so much like those which have been transcribed, that we spare the reader the weariness which we felt in reading it. But, lest it should be supposed that our philosopher neglected the Oriental Easter, from a bigoted attachment to the calculation of his own Church, it should be mentioned, that his journal for March 30—the Easter Sunday of the English Church (A. D. 1834)—makes no allusion at all to the season, although it is remarkably full, as he chanced to travel further than usual, and examined an extraordinary number of ancient ruins, in "a ride of nearly ten hours."

One illustration more will suffice to exhibit the temper of our author's mind.

"At this period of the struggle, the Christians used invariably to slay even their female prisoners. This was done to avoid what was regarded as a still deeper crime than murder, improper familiarity between their own warriors, and any woman who had not received Christian baptism."

To this passage the following note is annexed :—

"Most of the actors in the events alluded to, still look back on the

* The persecuted and ignorant Cretans still maintain their primitive Easter salutation, "Christ is risen!" with the response, "He is risen indeed."

cold-blooded massacre of their ill-fated female prisoners, as a mere discharge of a religious obligation! Thus they afford an additional, though needless, example of the dishonour and disgrace which redound to the sacred name of religion, when once usurped by superstition, or connected with crime; and make us sympathize with the ancient poet, who, after describing similar '*scelerosa atque impia facta*' of the miserable superstition which was called religion in his day, exclaims,

‘*Tantum religio potuit suadere malorum.*’”

We return to the text.

“The recent custom of the Christian insurgents in this island, repugnant as it is to *our** notions of religion and humanity, resembles the conduct which was sometimes enjoined on the ancient Israelites (as with respect to Jericho, Joshua, vi. 21; and against the Amalakites, 1 Samuel, xv. 38.) Their too lenient treatment of the Midianite women, whom they took captives ‘with their little ones,’ slaying only all the males, is represented as having excited the indignation of Moses.”

We have given after all but a mere outline of Mr. Pashley's character as an author. To fill up its details, we must not only multiply similar examples, but must defile our pages with others, exhibiting his studious and wholly gratuitous introduction of subjects and quotations commended to his notice only by their foul and revolting obscenity. On this subject we shall only say, that it would have been well if he had known something of the feeling which induced the Heathen author to preface one of these very passages with the words *οὐ μοι ἡδίων ἐστὶ λέγειν*. We now take our leave of him with hearty delight, desiring that we may henceforth be better strangers, and only inclined to fear lest our readers should complain that we have called their attention to him at all. And although it is melancholy, and cannot but excite feelings of mingled pity and disgust, that any educated Englishman should exhibit a mind so low and debased, yet we know not that we should have considered his work (learned as it is) to be worthy of their notice, if it had been left to stand or fall by its intrinsic merits. We regret to state, however, that this is not the case. Not only is it recommended by the author's station as a Fellow of the most distinguished society in the University of Cambridge, from whose press it issues; but he informs us that “his acknowledgments are due to the Syndics” of that press, “for a very liberal contribution out of the funds at their disposal towards its typographical expenses.” This announcement, we think, deserves the most serious attention of every member of the University. The endowments of these venerable societies, and the immunities of their press, were bestowed for the furtherance of sound learning and the maintenance of the Catholic faith. Are they to be prostituted in the

* The Italics are Mr. Pashley's.

cause of profaneness and irreligion? This, indeed, were an unmeet employment, of the bounty of pious founders, and of the patronage of a Christian legislature—an unfit course, whereby in a day of rebuke and blasphemy, to conciliate good men or to approve ourselves to Almighty God as good stewards of His manifold gifts. The sanction given to Mr. Pashley's work was given, of course, under some mistaken impression as to its character and principles; but on this very account, it is our duty the more plainly to exhibit their real nature.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Among the books, which we have received during the past quarter, are new editions of Dr. Southey's "*Book of the Church*," and Dr. Pye Smith's "*Scripture Testimony to the Messiah*." But these are works which neither demand criticism, nor require panegyric. We can only rejoice to see, in the extent of their circulation, an acknowledgment of their value. We ought to add, however, that this value is enhanced by additions and improvements which have been made to both these standard productions in their present shape.

SERMONS.

In addition to the Sermons already mentioned in this number, we are bound to specify the Rev. John H. Pinder's sound and excellent volume "*On the Book of Common Prayer, &c.*"

ALMOST more valuable, perhaps, as far as they go, are the *Sermons preached before the University of Oxford in the Years 1836, 1837. By the Rev. Charles A. Heurtley, M.A. Fellow of Corpus Christi College.* The doctrine is moderate and judicious: the style is logical and sensible:—and although it is improbable, in these days, that *all* should allow either Mr. Heurtly, or any other inquirer, to have adjudicated with complete accuracy between the conflicting claims—supposed at least to be conflicting—of Church authority and private judgment; and, again, between the respective claims of the Church Catholic and the Established Church of the realm, still, the remarks in both his fourth sermon and in his Preface—more especially from page xi. to page xiv. of the latter—are deserving of grave consideration; and at least show that he has embraced and regarded in his mind those several points, without an attention to *each* and *all* of which it is quite impossible that we should ever arrive at a wise and right decision, either in our speculations or our practice. If Mr. Heurtly swears by any master, he may be called a disciple of the great Hooker, and he could scarcely have chosen a better guide.

MUCH mighty matter is also to be found in the *Sermon preached before the University of Oxford on St. Peter's Day, 1837, by the Rev. Charles Henry Crawford*;—and still more, perhaps, in the Appendix and notes. We shall not, however, enter into the differences of opinion, whether real or apparent, between the author and Mr. Woodgate: nor discuss the existence of "*an innate moral faculty*,"—which *faculty*, by the way, is called elsewhere by Mr. Crawford, in the language of Brown, a *susceptibility of emotions*. We have already touched upon this intricate subject in our notice of Mr. Anderson's sermons; and, for the rest, these metaphysical logomachies must be quite end-

less; until writers shall endeavour to lay down, at starting, some accurate definition of the principal terms which they employ; and until opposing controversialists shall use the same words in the same sense.

OTHER single sermons of great excellence have reached us—some just too late for any mention in our last number:—such as Dr. Spry's Sermon at Canterbury on "*the Usefulness of a Classical Education*;"—the Discourse, preached at Colchester by the Rev. J. J. Blunt, intitled, "*Useful Knowledge no substitute for Religious Knowledge in a Scheme of National Education*;"—" *The comparative Estimate of Secular and Religious Learning*," by the Rev. James Lee Warner;—the Sermon preached by Dr. Hinds at the Visitation of the Bishop of Lincoln;—" *The Way of Christ prepared*," by the Rev. E. Bickersteth, "*An Address both to Christians and Jews*," earnest and impressive, though sometimes treading on uncertain ground;—Mr. Tritton's Sermon on "*The Office and Duties of the Clergy*;"—the "*Ordination Sermon of Mr. Crowthwaite*," and many others.

Mr. E. Thompson's Two Sermons on Marriage are earnest and well-timed; although, perhaps, they are not written throughout in the best taste, or with that meekness of wisdom which is most beneficial from the pulpit.

Congregational Lectures. Fifth Series. By George Redford, D.D. LL. D. Jackson and Walford. 1837.

EVERY series, which has yet appeared, of the "*Congregational Lectures*," has been an able and creditable performance; the present is not an exception. The subject chosen by Dr. Redford is, "*Holy Scripture verified; or the Divine Authority of the Bible confirmed by an Appeal to Facts of Science, History, and Human Consciousness*." This theme is an extremely fine one; but it is, perhaps, somewhat too vast for a course of lectures. The consequence is, that these nine discourses are of extreme length, and yet in their argument and its elucidation not always complete. They form, however, a receptacle of much valuable information, and much edifying disquisition:—nor, we think, will the pious wish, with which the writer concludes, have been cherished in vain: "Happy will the author of the present attempt consider himself, if his labours serve to remove, in however small a degree, the difficulties of any who rationally doubt, or to confirm the faith of any who sincerely believe."

RELIGIOUS MEMOIRS.

Journals and Letters of the Rev. Henry Martyn, B. D. Edited by the Rev. S. Wilberforce, M. A., Rector of Brighstone. Seeley and Burnside.

THESE "*Journals and Letters*," published under the able superintendence of Mr. Wilberforce, form an excellent companion to those Memoirs of Henry Martyn, which have made the prominent events of his life so well known, that

it must be needless to repeat them. There may be found, by those who read merely for amusement or excitement, something of sameness and monotony in the strain of reflections which penetrates, imbues, and pervades these volumes ; but delight as well as edification must grow upon the serious mind, as we contemplate the sincere and intense devotedness of such a man, displayed under every variety of circumstances, in the cause of salvation by Jesus Christ. Indeed, when we survey the character and labours of Pastors and Missionaries, such as Neff, as Oberlin, as Swartz, as David Brainerd, as Henry Martyn ; or, again, of such ministers as Romaine, Cecil, John Newton, Scott, Robinson of Leicester, Walker of Truro, Venn, Simeon, and many others, we may not agree with all the peculiar doctrines which they espoused ; we may not quite approve all that they said or did ; but still, we must be ready to exclaim with Bishop Jebb, "*sit mea anima cum illis.*" If any man doubts the power of the Gospel upon the heart—the animating and consoling power—let him diligently peruse these "*Journals and Letters.*" And yet there are some parts which have almost the interest of a novel. The letters to Miss Lydia Grenfell, and the insertions in the Journal concerning her, exhibit a depth, and strength, and tenderness of feeling, over which even they might weep, from whose bosoms the romance of youth has long and for ever vanished. They exhibit, sometimes, human love hallowed by divine ; sometimes, the fondest affections of the natural man struggling with the highest aspirations of the spiritual. The tale is one of honest, fervent, but in the end unfortunate, passion, without sickly and cloying sentimentality. The catastrophe of the life, in general, is most affecting.

We ought to add, that, in the introduction, Mr. Wilberforce has given us a brief but most engaging account of the Rev. John Sargent, the friend and biographer of Henry Martyn.

The Life and Times of the Rev. George Whitfield. By Robert Philip.
London : George Virtue.

SINCE the labours of Dr. Southey, it has become superfluous to enter at any length upon the Memoirs of Whitfield and his times. The great lesson, it seems to us, to be derived from Whitfield's life, and more especially from the strange rambling account of it which is now before us, is the value of delivery to a public speaker. We know of no instance which so completely bears out the axiom of Demosthenes. Here is a young man of three-and-twenty, arresting the attention of many thousands of persons at a time,—persons, in many cases, notoriously of profane habits and licentious characters, swearers, drunkards, blasphemers, sabbath-breakers ; now attracting multitudes away from the humours of a fair, or the fascinations of an itinerant theatre ; now drawing contrite tears down the iron cheeks of miners and colliers—swaying their hearts and minds—exciting, impressing, melting, subduing, overpowering them ; and effecting these marvels, after all, without one particle of wisdom, and with but a slender portion of genuine ability. Something must, of course, be attributed to the evident piety of the man—something to his earnest zeal—

something to his self-endangering and self-sacrificing boldness—something to the startling novelty of his exhibitions—something to the nature of his doctrines, which were often calculated by their very extravagance to catch and govern the audiences to which they were addressed; but, we repeat, the main secret of his success was the charm and animation of his delivery—the magic of voice, and countenance, and gesture. In real talent and sagacity, in extent and depth of attainments, in far-sighted and comprehensive views, Whitfield was altogether and immeasurably inferior to John Wesley. Wesley was a legislator—Whitfield was only an orator. Wesley had in him some of the highest elements of the statesman or the ruler, the founder of an empire or a sect; he had a sustained and regulated ambition, skill, vigilance, perseverance, the power of calculation, the power of combination, the power of command. Whitfield was an eloquent enthusiast, and nothing more. Wesley, therefore, has left behind him a monument of his exertions, which may be almost said to be as wide as the circumference of the globe, as enduring as the religious emotions of mankind. He has left behind him in both hemispheres a vast and increasing number of Christians identified with his memory and his name. Whitfield's influence was merely personal, and has been rapidly decaying and wearing out from the moment of his death. Nay, even as to the constituents of eloquence, Whitfield possessed the *external* rather than the *internal*. His *matter* was often worthless; but good and fastidious judges were quite captivated and enchained by his *manner*. This manner—this unrivalled excellence in—if we may so call them—the histrionic ingredients of the preacher, was, however, so potent as to awaken, we believe, the jealousy of Wesley, and sometimes to do wonders where even Wesley had failed. Let it not be supposed from these observations, that we would make Whitfield a model, in any way, for the regular Clergy of the Established Church; but still the moral of his history, for such we almost consider it, ought not to be altogether lost.

Memoir of the Life and Writings of John Albert Bengel, Prelate in Würtemberg. Translated from the German by Robert Francis Walker, M. A. London: William Ball, Paternoster Row.

THIS *Memoir* gives at considerable length and under various aspects the life of a very pious, active, and learned man. It may be read with much advantage; but the bulk of the volume, and the multifariousness of its contents, preclude us from attempting an analysis in the small space which remains at our disposal. There are many valuable remarks; but many also, which are rather curious than sound. Much of the matter, though in an English dress, is *very German*; for instance, we might refer our readers to what is called, at page 503, "*A temptation of a peculiar kind*," "when it was said to Bengel, that possibly he might be meant by *the third Angel in the Apocalypse*, &c." Spener, it appears, was considered by Bengel as the *second Angel*. But this, we must allow, is not a fair average sample. The translation is dedicated to that excellent man, Dr. Steinkopff.

While we are on the subject of *Memoirs*, *Biographies*, and personal *Histories* in general, we may as well mention that some complaints have reached us, not however from the authors themselves, because we have not reviewed Dr. Dibdin's *Reminiscences*, and some other publications of a similar nature. Our silence, let us assure our correspondents, has not been occasioned by any aspersions which may have been cast upon our own labours, or opinions, or motives. But there are reasons anterior to any peculiarities which a book may contain, why we cannot look with much complacency upon a living man's reminiscences of living men. It is almost always better that the publication of such things should be deferred until death, which turns as it were contemporaneous accounts into history, has closed against the accents, whether of praise or blame, the ear both of the describer and the subject of his description; until the partialities and the prejudices, the friendships and the rivalries, the patronage and the dependence, of all parties concerned, have been buried in the one common and absorbing grave. And even the compilation of the reminiscences, we think, properly belongs to that last period of existence, when a man has done with the busy scene of human affairs; when he is no longer an actor upon the open stage, no longer troubled and tossed about by the alternations of success and failure; but when his feverish struggles have subsided into a calm, and his enthusiastic admiration or his fiery animosities into comparative indifference; and the mind, looking forward to another world, reposes from the agitations of the present, and is influenced only by just and sober, by dispassionate and solemn, by kindly and charitable feelings. While a writer, instead of having quite closed his career, is either preparing his triumphs, or nursing up his griefs, in a temporary retirement; while he is still an expectant of favours and a sharer in many competitions; while his bosom is still throbbing and tumultuating with the strongest passions of manhood, panting with ambition or stung with disappointment; it cannot but happen, that *that* which is prospective will interfere with that which is retrospective; the contingencies of the future will throw their lights and shadows over the realities of the past; and the pictures of the memory will be disturbed by the intruding shapes of hope and fear. The pencil in such a case will, almost inevitably, be dipped in the wrong colours, and trace either incorrect or unsteady lines; the drawing will not be taken either from the right point of vision, or with a right frame of disposition; and every touch may be either a libel or a flattery, a compliment or a satire. Works of this kind have appeared in every country, which have dishonoured its literature scarcely less than a string of scandals or a catalogue of dedications; inasmuch as they have been filled either with false prepossessions or furious dislikes, with servile adulation or scurrilous calumny, with fawning sycophancy or desperate malignity.

Nor, indeed, if every portrait in the gallery were a faithful likeness of the original, is it at all clear that such an exhibition ought to be opened. With all memoirs published during the life-time, and the living activity, of persons, who are still bound together by mutual relations and ties of intercourse, many and most obvious inconveniences are inseparably interwoven. Panegyrics and censure may be liable to equal objection, and will give, perhaps, almost equal

annoyance. The statements, unless they are weak and sinewless, inane and vapid, to an extreme degree, may look at least like violations of confidence, and an invasion of those decencies and sanctities which social usage and social comfort demand. The evil may be the same, at least in kind, as if a bag of private letters should be opened at the post-office, and printed for the public inspection and amusement; or if men, in a mixed and numerous company, were to give at large their entire opinion of each other, and each other's friends.

WORKS ON EDUCATION.

HERE it was our intention to scrutinize the publications put forth by the *Central Society of Education*, in a searching, yet not unfriendly spirit; but we are compelled to relinquish our design for want of room. The *Reading Books, a Series of Lessons and Course of Reading*, by the Rev. J. M. McCulloch, Minister of Kelso, have arrived so late in the quarter, that, having no leisure to examine them carefully, we are merely enabled to state our first and hasty impression, which unquestionably is, that they are very well adapted to their purpose, namely, to the progressive stages of intellectual cultivation in the humbler ranks of society.

By the way, while speaking of education, we cannot but state our satisfaction at the growing coincidence of opinion which seems to exist on this momentous topic in the minds of all reflecting persons, with the exception, perhaps, of a few nervous alarmists on the one side, and some individual members of the Central Society on the other. It is now agreed—and here, as in many other cases, where agreement is at length reached, we can only wonder how any previous controversy could have been raised with respect to truths so self-evident;—it is now agreed, that Education is a transcendent good, that the range of popular education may be extended, and its subjects multiplied with manifest advantage; but that, if an attempt be made to disconnect it from religion, education itself may lose all its value, and almost be converted into a curse. It is now agreed, that Education ought to be universal as to its recipients; but that the way to render Education hateful, is to render it compulsory; it is generally felt that any Administration, or any Board of Commissioners, which should think of enforcing attendance at schools by fines or penalties, would be regarded as an educational press-gang; and that no kind of impressment can ever be acceptable to the people of England.

But these main principles being allowed, namely, universality as far as it is attainable without compulsion; the extension of the range of teaching—and Scriptural religion the central focus and consecrating power of general instruction—a wide and solid basis may, we trust, be laid, for concord, and advancement, and improvement. We trust, that the two great Educational Societies, since obviously they cannot work together, will be suffered to proceed, each on its own course, with a generous and not hostile competition: and that Churchmen will not have any peculiar discouragements and impediments thrown in their way; but that they will experience, in a due proportion, that cordial

assistance from the Government which is afforded in other quarters. They cannot be content with less; we do not think that they are likely to ask more. Whether the remaining differences can, or cannot be comfortably adjusted, it might be premature even to conjecture: but, so far, it is certainly a satisfaction to ourselves to find, that the sentiments which we have repeatedly expressed, are now borne out by the concurrent sense of the nation.

And here we cannot but express our cordial thanks to Dr. Jones, of Bedford, that in an admirable and touching lecture on the "*Literary Beauty of the Bible*," he has found, or rather seized, an opportunity of thus mentioning our labours, in a kind of episode on the subject of Education.

"For these remarks, I am indebted to the British Critic—a quarterly journal, which advocates strenuously, uniformly, and ably, the cause of universal education;—a journal, from which I have borrowed, on former occasions, many a noble sentiment on the subject of popular enlightenment, and by which I have been taught, how feasible it is, to be most true and faithful to the Church of England, and yet to be the zealous champion of an outspread of knowledge, fenced and sanctified by religion, through the length and breadth of the united kingdom."

To have in any degree *merited* this encomium, to have contributed but one stone to the mighty temple of human improvement, based on the sacred foundation of the Gospel and the Apostolical Church, would be to our minds more than wealth, more than celebrity, more than an adequate reward in the midst of some difficulties and some misconceptions.

MISCELLANEOUS WORKS.

The Present State and Prospects of the Church and the World. By a Clergyman of the Church of England. Seeley and Co. 1837.

THE publication which rejoices in this contracted and unassuming title—and *any* other would be quite as applicable to its contents—consists of nine lectures and an Appendix, full of rambling remarks and miscellaneous quotations. The author is too modest: he does himself injustice, as we shall presently see, by not adding the *Past History* of the Church and the World to the Present State and Future Prospects. But to be serious; the whole tone is wild and violent. We must, however, confine ourselves to a single citation,—one, alas, which shows, with too clear a demonstration, what kind of spirit towards his predecessors and his brethren in the Church can still actuate, here and there, *a Clergyman of the Church of England.*"

"The writer professes not a profound acquaintance with prophecy; but several passages, both of the Old and New Testaments, would lead us to expect in these last days, a more than ordinary defection from the faith. And certainly, when we consider existing appearances, there seems but too much reason to prognosticate, that this awful, this terrific period is drawing very near indeed to its commencement.

"All these evils are in a great measure attributable to the greivous unfaithfulness of the Churches in these kingdoms for a long period, terminating about forty

years since. Britain was once the glory of all lands ; prosperous at home, and respected abroad ; but ‘ pure religion and undefiled ’ was then *her* glory. Her prelates, as Cranmer and Hooper, and Latimer and Jewell, and Hall and Beveridge, were apostolic. Her pastors, as Bradford, and Gilpin, and Baxter, and Herbert, and Henry, were clothed with righteousness, pastors after God’s own heart, that fed the people. Then were the palmy days of the Church of England. Then was it well with us. But alas ! it is the tendency of all things sublunary to degenerate. The fatal Act of Uniformity was passed, which drove from the pale of the English establishment such a goodly company of ministers, as occasioned her a loss of vitality, from which she is only now beginning to recover. Presently an ominous cloud came over her—chilling her devotional fervour, and obscuring her doctrinal brightness. Then succeeded a darkness that was felt. The priest’s lips kept knowledge no longer. The law perished from the learned, and counsel from the prudent. The shepherds, indeed, ate the fat, and clothed themselves with the wool, but they fed not their flocks ; so that they were scattered, and became meat to all the beasts of the field. They wandered through all the mountains, and none did search or seek after them.

“ The clergy, in place of being ensamples to the people in whatsoever things were pure, lovely, and of good report, were their leaders in all that was vicious and scandalous. They forsook the study of the Scriptures for the study of the world ; the chamber of the sick for the scene of dissipation. They had become dumb dogs that could not bark. They had forsaken the word of the Lord, and what wisdom was in them ?

“ The truth being no longer clearly and constantly proclaimed from the pulpit, faith which cometh and is nourished by hearing, gradually declined. The people were destroyed for lack of knowledge. There was ‘ like people, like priest.’ The worship of God in spirit and in truth was superseded by a cold and heartless formality ; and nominal protestantism became little better than real popery. People rested in the ‘ opus operatum,’ the mere act and letter of observances ; and relied on their own doings, instead of the merits of the Mediator, to obtain them justification. During this ‘ dark age’ of the English church, the sun of Christianity not only did not remain stationary in her hemisphere, it absolutely retrograded (*sic*) many degrees ; so that of her it might, in a spiritual sense, be lamented, in the pathetic language of inspiration, ‘ Her Nazarites ~~were~~ purer than snow ; they were whiter than milk, they were more ruddy in body than rubies ; their polishing was of sapphire. Their visage is blacker than a coal ; they are not known in the streets : their skin cleaveth to their bones ; it is withered, it is become as a stick.’

“ Could these dry bones live ? yes ; all things are possible with God. His Spirit came from the four winds, and breathed upon these slain, so that they revived and stood up, an exceeding great army. All the three national Churches awoke as in the ancient days, and put on their beautiful garments. The glory of the Lord was risen upon them ; and they presently shone as cities set upon hills, reflecting a moral lustre around the lands. But alas ! the con-

sequences of long neglect are not remedied speedily, nor the guilt of it soon forgotten by the Almighty. While the husbandman slept, the enemy sowed tares in the field; which have sprung up in such a noxious crop of vices, as will only be exterminated by the Spirit of judgment and of burning. A storm has been raised in the just anger of the Lord, that will not easily be allayed. His heritage has become unto him as a speckled bird; the birds round about her are against her. 'Syria is confederate with Ephraim in the war against Jerusalem.' Our holy and our beautiful house, where our fathers worshipped, they seek not to repair but to demolish.

"Its very existence they call its crime; they cry, 'Down with it, down with it, even to the ground!' They break down its carved work with axes and hammers. That venerable religious establishment, which has been the main pillar and ground of the truth in these realms, which we may term, indeed, the very spinal bone of the empire, they are proceeding to destroy, thereby endangering the whole body politic through which it is extended. Her bishoprics have been abolished, her ministers murdered, and herself loaded with the whole vocabulary of abuse."—p. 16—20.

Alas, who can wonder, that men should wish to break *the spinal bone of the empire*, or, in language less superb, to dismember and destroy the Establishment, when such a description of its recent state is given by one of its ministers; when he has "*loaded it with the whole vocabulary of abuse*," when too, as is plain from the tenor of that minister's allegations, the re-animation, even now, must be by no means complete? We do not, as we have proved, take part with Mrs. Trollope; but who can wonder, if (so called) orthodox clergymen should be sometimes goaded into animosity or disgust, when their fathers, and themselves by implication, are made the subjects of such outrageous and unmeasured vituperations?

UNDER the head of "*Miscellaneous Works*" we beg warmly to recommend to our readers *the Elements of Syriac Grammar*, by the Rev. George Phillips, M. A., Fellow and Tutor of Queen's College, Cambridge; published in London, by Mr. Parker of the Strand. The work is a thin octavo, which may be examined at no great expense of time or trouble, and is introduced by a judicious preface, explaining the use and importance of the study of the Syriac language.

MR. Kemp's "*Refutation of Non-Conformity, &c.*," we need now scarcely commend. Our recommendation comes almost too late. The volume, as Dr. Johnson said on a very different occasion of himself, "is known, and does not want it."

IN exactly reprinting the "*Diocesan Statutes of the Roman Catholic Bishops of the Province of Leinster*," Mr. M'Ghee, we think, has adopted the right course. The introduction, too, to the Latin "*Statuta Diocesana*," is at least curious and striking.

THE *Second Series of the Young Christian's Sunday Evening*, by Mrs. Parry; "*The Young Christian's Glossary*;" "*The Visit to the Great Oasis of the Lybian Desert*, by G. A. Hoskins, Esq.;" the "*Chemistry of Nature*, by Hugo Reid;" "*Hunter's Satires and Epistles of Horace*;" "*Welcome and Farewell, a Tragedy*,"—with a variety of occasional Reports, Pamphlets, &c., we should have been glad to notice more at large, but that our space has been more than required by theological and ecclesiastical matters of immediate and pressing interest.

Our excuse must be the same, that we can only return our general thanks for the continuation of those beautiful works, which at once adorn our literature, and illustrate "*Scotland*," "*Switzerland*," "*the Tyrol*," "*the Country of the Waldenses*," "*the Ports and Harbours of Great Britain*," "*Oxford and Cambridge*," "*the Churches of London*," "*the Cathedrals of England and the Continent*."

SACRED POETRY.

The Poetical Works of the Rev. Thomas Dale, M. A. London: Charles Tilt, Fleet Street. 1836.

THESE elegant and pathetic poems, although they have but lately reached us in their collected form, are too well known among Christian readers to need much criticism now. They have many beauties; but the deficiency or the fault—and it is a serious one—is the want of power. We miss that strength of language which results from intensity and energy of thought. The flow of the verse is almost too smooth, too equable, too regular; and we should sometimes hail with pleasure the abruptness of the water-fall, or the impetuous dash of the rapid torrent. Polished, classical, harmonious, these productions commit no offences against taste, no outrages upon the "modesty of nature," or the rules of art. But the "brave neglect," "the graces beyond the reach" of all mere structure of versification, and all mere modulations of sound; the masculine vigour, the daring and eagle-winged flights of a lofty genius,—the burning, startling, unforgotten words of irrepressible emotion; in short, the highest and sublimest triumphs of poetry are nowhere to be found. The volume may be said to resemble a quiet landscape, smiling with the loveliness of the grove and the valley, tamed into fertility, and rich with careful cultivation; but deficient, on that very account, in the bolder and grander charms of this earth so prodigal of all beauty—the solemn depth of the forest, the majestic aspect of the mountain-solitudes, the terrible and as it were conscious repose of the unfathomed ocean.

It is superfluous to add, that this volume thoroughly deserves the praise which Mr. Dale claims for it in a brief and modest preface. The moral purity which it breathes, heightened and sublimed by earnest piety, is altogether unexceptionable and unquestionable. It is a book which the father of a family might see with satisfaction in the hands of his youngest daughter; and that daughter might read every word of it without a blush at the moment, or a sigh of regret at any subsequent period of life. In this sense, therefore, Mr. Dale,

of whose amiable character the publication is a proof, may have the full consolation of reflecting, that he has written

“No line which, dying, he would wish to blot.”

And believing, as we do, that the faculties of the imagination are to be cultivated as well as every other faculty, which it has pleased God to give us—that they are sources, not only of exquisite enjoyment, but of inestimable benefit, if cultivated aright—that they may be even instrumental towards the perception and appreciation of the highest and divinest truths; we are cordially glad to recommend a collection of poems, which, without unduly stimulating or pampering them at the expense of any other capacities, may supply to them a wholesome, and grateful, and unobjectionable aliment.

AMERICAN WORKS.

THE literary importations from America are always acceptable, always valuable. The fresh numbers of “*The Missionary*,” are, as usual, excellent. The “*Fifth Conventional Address of Bishop Doane; and the Rector's Christmas Offering for 1836, being a Pastoral Address to the Parishioners of St. Mary's Church, Burlington, New Jersey, on the Christian's Duty of Family Worship*,” do not require our recommendation, and are above it.

Perhaps, however, the most interesting document which has lately crossed the Atlantic, though the language, we think, might in some places be simplified with great advantage, is “*An Appeal to Parents for Female Education on Christian Principles, with a Prospectus of St. Mary's Hall, Green Bank, Burlington, New Jersey*. The Institution, it is said, deserves to be called a *School for Mothers*; and the writer proceeds:—

“But it is time that we approach our statement of the Plan, immediate objects, and important advantages of the proposed Institution. Reflecting much and often on the subject, it has seemed always of the first propriety,—may we not say necessity?—that *the education of females should be, as nearly as possible, domestic*. If it were possible to avoid it, no daughter should be educated out of the shadow of the parental roof. Whatever may be said of the other sex, home is the congenial atmosphere of woman; and, better than all teachers, for female children, is the gentle, prudent, pious mother. But it may not always be so. For various reasons, many girls will always be sent abroad to receive their education. The next best thing to their own native fireside, is to prepare a home for them—to supply to them, as nearly as may be, the dear domestic influences—to institute anew, so far as nature will permit, the parental relation—to give them, in a word, another father and another mother. To this end, the first consideration has been *the formation of the domestic establishment* of the Institution.

“Of the household which is thus constituted, teachers and scholars will alike be members. They will dwell under the same roof. They will gather round the same table. They will kneel at the same altar. The age, the sacred

office, the venerable aspect, the exalted character of the reverend head of the family, will not only entitle him to the respect due to a father, but will win for him also the confidence and the affection; while, in the gentler nature of the excellent Christian lady, who will discharge the offices of Matron, there are eminently combined the gifts, and graces, and charities, which make up, and endear the mother. All will thus be daughters. All will be sisters. So far as may be, all will be, not only, but feel that they are, at home. The domestic nurture will be restored to them. They will revive the domestic interests. They will enjoy the domestic influences. And the great end desired for each of them will be, her fitness to adorn and bless, as daughter, sister, wife, or mother, that one sweet, sheltered spot, the native nestling place of woman, and her own peculiar empire, her home.

“ For such a purpose, celestial influences must be combined with what is best of earth, and our newly constituted family must form a Christian Household. Last of all places to be left without ‘ the care of souls,’ is a seat of female education. Fullest of promise, in its present influence, and in future permanent results, will be the exercise, in such a fold, of the pastoral relation. The father of the family will, therefore, also be the shepherd of the lambs. The priestly and the patriarchal office will be again combined. Every morning will be consecrated, and every evening blessed, with prayer. The word of God will be daily read, and its sacred truths enforced, in the hearing of all. The careful study of the sacred text will be furthered by encouragement and assistance, in every proper form. The habit of private devotion will be promoted and cherished, to the utmost. A pastoral care, knit with parental love, will wait, and pray, and watch, to ‘ warn them that are unruly, comfort the feeble-minded, support the weak, be patient toward all.’

“ Upon our Christian household, for its growth in grace, and in the knowledge and love of God, it is our purpose to bring to bear, to the fullest extent, the institutions, the ordinances, and the influences of THE CHURCH. It will enjoy the benefit of constant and immediate *Episcopal* supervision. Its worship, whether in the chapel, or in the parish church, will be of kindred character; and divine service will be attended, not only on the Lord’s day, but on all the festivals and fasts of the Christian year. ‘ The doctrines, constitution, and liturgy of the Church ’ will be subjects of constant and diligent instruction. Preparation for the apostolic ordinance of confirmation, as indeed for the due reception of both the sacraments, will be kept constantly in view; and, in short, nothing will be left undone to imbue every mind with the principles, and every heart with the piety, of the primitive ages of the Church; and to render St. Mary’s Hall a nursery of pure and undefiled religion. It is thought best to state distinctly this characteristic of the Institution, that there may be no disappointment and no dissatisfaction. The doors will be open for all. All who desire instruction will be welcome, whatever be their religious birthright, or the profession of their parents. But all who come will be instructed in the same principles, accustomed to the same worship, and trained to the same discipline. There will thus be no division of interest, and no collision of feeling. Serious

interruptions will be avoided. Unprofitable comparisons will be prevented. Important influences will be secured. There is, as Paul assures us, but 'one Lord, one faith, one baptism;' and it will be our constant prayer and effort, 'to keep the unity of the Spirit, in the bond of peace.'

"For the daughters of this Christian household, securing *first*, so far as lies in us, that they shall be brought up 'in the nurture and admonition of the Lord,' **THE BEST TEACHERS** in every department of **SCIENCE, LITERATURE, and THE FINE ARTS**, proper to such an institution, shall be procured, and every possible facility shall be afforded, that its pupils, duly improving their opportunities, may become well-instructed and accomplished Christian ladies. As soon as may be, after the organization is complete, a plan of study, suited to this end, to occupy at least three years, after the necessary elements are acquired, will be marked out and adopted, as the regular course of the Institution; and though scholars will be received for shorter periods, not less than a year, and entered according to their proficiency, the preference will always be given to such as will comply with its full requirements. In directing the education of young ladies, it is a nice matter to distribute in their just proportion, the *useful* and the *ornamental*. It will be our aim to make the useful, ornamental; and the ornamental, useful. The hardest woods receive the highest polish. The elegant accomplishments of the sex are never seen to such advantage, as when they crown and grace a well-cultivated, a well-stored, and a well-balanced mind. It is not the time to state, in full detail, the system of instruction. However easy such a sketch might be, and however attractive; it will be far safer and more useful in the retrospect, than it could be in prospective. Suffice it to say, for the general subject, that *development rather than mere acquirement* is regarded as the end—that, to be *thorough and accurate*, will always be required in every undertaking—and that, in all departments, the chief reference will always be to *the practical purposes of life*. The administration of the business of instruction will be committed to **A PRINCIPAL TEACHER**, a well-educated, experienced and accomplished Christian lady, with assistant teachers in the several branches. All the teachers and officers will be constantly responsible to the bishop of the diocese, as patron and principal of the establishment.

"As important details, the following may be mentioned here. All expenditures, for the use of the pupils, must be made under the direction of the head of the family; with whom all moneys must be lodged. A proper economy will be strictly enjoined on all. Constant attention will be paid to the health, and physical vigour of the pupils; in furtherance of which a suitable course of exercise will be systematically pursued. In each of the dormitories, an assistant teacher will be constantly present with the scholars, who will all occupy single beds. Every scholar will be expected to attend to all the varieties of plain sewing, and to the various branches of domestic economy, under the direction of the Matron, or other suitable person. The cultivation of sacred music, both vocal and instrumental, will be rendered, as nearly as may be, universal. A choir for the Chapel will be selected, of those most competent;

and it will be an object to qualify as many of the pupils as possible to preside at the organ, and to take part in the psalmody of the Church. As an important means of improving the literary taste, and confirming the moral and religious principles of the scholars, a library of suitable books, in the various departments, will be formed; to which additions will, from time to time, be made, under the direction of the Bishop; and no other books, besides the school books and books of devotion, will be allowed within the walls of the Institution.

“As a proper recognition of the Christian duty of benevolence, and as a grateful acknowledgment to Him who put it into the hearts of men to project and to establish this Institution, for the Christian education of females, provision is made, and will be continued, *for the entirely gratuitous support and instruction of one scholar in every ten*, making application as *the daughter of a clergyman* of the Church, deceased; or, if living, in necessitous circumstances. Such application to be made known only to the Head of the family, and to the Bishop; on whose approval it shall be granted.”

We do not now ask, whether, or not, any such institution is necessary, or would be practicable among ourselves, but the state of *Female Education* is one that well deserves a serious and comprehensive inquiry.

Protestant Jesuitism. By a Protestant. New York. 1836.

THIS is a strange and startling book, of which the main object seems to be to expose and hold up to public reprobation certain proceedings of the Temperance Society in the United States. The author declares, at the end, “there are principles asserted and defended in it, which not only convict the Temperance Society of being a ‘superfluity of naughtiness,’ but a public nuisance.” He had before said, at p. 103—106:—

“Far be it from the author to] desire that the old habit of using ardent spirits should become common again. Thus far he allows that the Temperance efforts have achieved a victory. Nevertheless, the victory has been won, not alone by unfair means and by force, but at an expense of virtue, of health, and of life, which stand over against the benefit in the array of a fearful odds. And this is not all: the system has driven thousands into the habit of secret drinking, which, in the great majority of instances, is likely to end in their ruin; so that it remains at least doubtful whether the number of drunkards has been diminished. And it has by its intolerance banished multitudes from the common pale of society, made them desperate, and cut them off from redeeming influences. Nearly all the advancements of the Temperance reformation have been forced—forced upon ground which cannot be maintained, because the public, when their eyes shall be opened, are not likely to submit to such a sway. The project of banishing wine, beer, cider, &c. entirely from society, is a wild

and vain scheme; and yet the cause of the Temperance Society, in its present position and relations, is staked on this contingency. It goes for the whole, under the risk of losing the whole. Extravagance heaped upon extravagance has pushed into an extreme, which can be maintained only by the perpetual accumulation and imposition of similar devices. Common sense, after all, will assert and recover its rightful dominion; the pride of self-government and the desire of self-respect cannot be annihilated, and will return with its claims; sobriety will outlive fanaticism; men will find that the best economy of society is, not to set every man a guardian over his neighbour, and commission him to hold perpetual inquisition over his private conduct and habits; but that every individual should stand upon the basis of his own personal virtue, panoplied with his own armour, be the keeper of his own conscience, holding the sovereign right and use of his own judgment, provided he does not encroach on the rights of his neighbour; and, in our opinion, they will find, moreover, that the machinery of the Temperance Society, as now organized, is inconvenient, impertinently obtrusive, creating artificial relations in society, which must always work badly, and which are alike destructive of social happiness as of personal virtue and strength of individual character. Even now the public have become so dependant on this factitious system, so enervated by its chains, that, if set at once at liberty, they would hardly know how to govern themselves. We have even reason to fear they would run into wild and dangerous excesses. Like slaves, incapacitated for the care of themselves by the habits of a long-protracted bondage and subjection to a master's will, a sudden emancipation might be injurious.

“ The author is aware that the imputation of Jesuitism to this and some other associations of a kindred class, is a suggestion which ought not to be conveyed without good reasons. He does not, however, pretend, that it is a spirit of so heinous a character as that which actuated the school which gave birth to this name, in the height of its atrocities. He only means to intimate what he conscientiously believes, that associations originally organized among us under the motives of a commendable reforming spirit, have since discovered, in the height of their influence, that the public mind is susceptible of being subjected and swayed to almost any extent by institutions of this kind, artfully and skilfully managed; that the love of power has found a place with the spirit of doing good, and corrupted it; that conscience has not always and alone been consulted in the projects of these societies, but rather, and to a great extent, the means of acquiring influence; that the extravagance of new doctrines and false theories has detracted alike from the wisdom and virtue of these institutions, and tempted their leaders into unwarrantable experiments; that for the attainment of their objects, they have found it convenient and advantageous to adopt and practise the arts of political combinations; that they have employed unworthy and bad means for good ends; that religious sectarianism has been admitted to an improper influence, and extensively shaped their measures and controlled their operations; and that these and other faults have so vitiated these societies as to leave them deeply leavened with the appropriate spirit of

Jesuitism, so far as the character of the age and the state of society will admit."

Now, there is some truth and marrow in these remarks, although they may be charged with overstatement; and, *mutatis mutandis, exceptis excipiendis*, their truth is applicable to other than Temperance Societies. With respect to these themselves, we must regret—and, alas, *where* have we *not* reason to regret the same misfortune?—that a good cause is injured by the rashness and extravagance of its supporters. It does appear to us, that some of the assertions of the *Tee-Totallers* in England have been almost as preposterous as their name; nor is it a valid defence to argue that *Tee-Totallism* is, nevertheless, better than drunkenness. It does appear to us, that certain hot and misguided, though well-intentioned men, most intemperate in the prosecution of temperance, may, in the end, not merely bring ridicule on the sacred cause of sobriety, but may advance beyond, and even against, the letter and spirit of the Bible; and, without accusing the Saviour in so many words, like them of old, of being gluttonous and a wine-bibber, may lead to the inference that he did an injurious and unjustifiable thing, when he performed his first miracle of turning water into wine at a marriage-feast. Nay, what *can* be said—how can the true interests either of religion or temperance be consulted, when it is made to follow, as an inevitable conclusion from the premises, that it is improper, if not positively sinful, to use even a little wine at the Communion Table, in the administration of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper? Yet, let our readers observe, what is stated by clergymen and professors in America, themselves advocates of almost *total abstinence*, while they reprobate, by an appropriate appellation, "this '*go-a-head*' system, no matter how fast and how far." Thus,

"Dr. Reese said, in the progress of the debate on this resolution:—'There is no species of ultraism more to be deplored, or more treacherous and fallacious, than that which maintains that the taking of any quantity of alcohol, however diluted or compounded, is *malum in se*—is necessarily and in all circumstances a moral offence; especially when this doctrine is looked at in connexion with moral science. It is greatly to be deprecated, that Temperance Societies should attempt to exercise prerogatives which do not belong to them. I conceive that this Convention is wholly unauthorized to give any decision on such questions. They are questions in moral science, and do not pertain to us. We are not here to pass resolutions of denunciation, and send them forth as so many Popish bulls, or ecclesiastical anathemas denouncing our fellow-men—men as upright and as conscientious as ourselves It has here been distinctly avowed, that the taking of one drop of alcohol in any form, is not only taking so much poison, but is in all cases a sin. And then we were entertained with a sapient comment on the conduct of our Saviour; and it was asked, with airs of triumph, whether it could be possible that Jesus Christ ever consecrated such a substance as alcohol to be the memorial of his death? And the allusion was carried fully out, and a blow openly struck at the use of wine in the Lord's Supper. Should this Convention suffer the resolutions that have already been passed to go out to the world, and take no

steps to avoid their being misunderstood [or rather, rightly understood] then, sir, the axe is laid at the root of the Temperance cause, and the Church of God and the ministers of his Gospel, throughout the length and breadth of this land, will be constrained, by their duty to God and their regard for his laws, to abandon you, and to raise their voice against what they believe to be a pernicious heresy, reflecting on Jesus Christ, and tending to subvert his ordinances." —pp. 255, 256.

The Rev. Professor Potter, too, declared. "If a man holds all use of wine in our own houses to be morally wrong, because wine is a poison, then he holds that any use of wine at the table of the Lord must be morally wrong, because it is as poisonous there as any where else. And the man who takes one drop of wine from God's table, goes so far towards poisoning himself; that is, he violates the law of God in the very act by which he obeys the last injunction of his Saviour. He cannot keep Christ's dying command without violating a primary law of his being; and so the very article which Jesus Christ selected and consecrated as the perpetual symbol in his Church of the blessings of salvation, was an article which contained poison! The Son of God selected, as the symbol of his own shed blood, and gave to be received and drunk by his disciples—poison!"—p. 259.

Such discussions, in themselves, have something painful and distressing to a Christian mind.

Sermons on Restitution, &c. by the Rev. Freidrich Strauss, D.D. Translated from the German, by Miss Lee. London. Wertheim. Seeley.

WE hardly know in what place we ought to have mentioned this little work; but we may state here, that, looking at these Sermons, apart from the other labours of Dr. Strauss, we consider them, on the whole, powerful and impressive, though sometimes strange to our English ears; popular and practical, rather than speculative or philosophical; and, while containing little or nothing of abstract or doctrinal theology, speaking with skill and effect to the minds and consciences of a miscellaneous congregation.

SEVERAL works have, as usual, arrived too late. As to *one* of them, we can only re-state our objection to recommend any *Congregational Hymn-Book*, which has not, *at least*, the sanction of the bishop of the diocese. The Memoir of "*Luther and his Times*," by Mr. Riddle, is the production of a diligent and learned student, and exhibits a striking portrait of a man, who, by the force of his talents and the energy of his character—to put all other circumstances for the moment aside—has exerted a vast and almost unrivalled influence in the Christian world. We forbear to say more at present: because, to the relations between Lutheranism and Church-of-Englandism, it may be deemed desirable hereafter to advert.

THE
BRITISH CRITIC,
AND
Quarterly Theological Review.

APRIL, 1838.

ART. I.—*The Life and Times of the Rev. George Whitefield, M. A.* By Robert Philip. London: Virtue, 1837. 8vo.

WE are told by Mr. Philip, in his preface, that the time is not yet come, for the *philosophy* of Whitefield's life; but that, nevertheless, it is fast approaching; and that, consequently, his mass of facts will soon be turned to good account, by himself, or by some one else. In the course of his work, however, the author suggests that the collection of *facts* will never be complete, until there shall appear an *American*, as well as an *English* biography, of this extraordinary man: America having been one of the grand *observatories* from which the phenomena of the erratic luminary might be most distinctly seen, and most accurately examined.

Now, with regard to the *philosophy* of Whitefield's life, we have to remark that the phrase is one which conveys to us little but hazy and indistinct conceptions. It is possible, however, that the writer has here identified, in his own mind, the mighty itinerant himself with the cause of which he was so striking a representative; and that, by the *philosophy* of Whitefield's life, he means neither more nor less than a profound and masterly disquisition into the concentration of those *nebulous* elements, which had long been floating abroad in the firmament of our Reformation; and which, gradually gathering substance, appeared at last in the portentous forms of Wesley, and of Whitefield. We collect something like this, from a sort of promise, held out by Mr. Philip, that if "the honest *Catholicity* of his present work should commend it, it may be followed by *Annals and Illustrations of Evangelical Preaching*, from the dawn of the Reformation, to the close of the present century." In other words—unless we greatly misapprehend him—the author proposes to himself the honour of achieving that high *philosophy*, which is to solve all the phenomena, not only of the life and character of Whitefield, but of those complex movements and workings which had their con-

summation, in *his* appearance, and in that of his marvellous colleague in the process of religious *agitation*.

If such be, in truth, his ambition, he may be assured that he will have before him a task worthy of the very loftiest powers: a task, which demands the amplest range of reading, the deepest resources of thought, the profoundest knowledge of human nature, the most dispassionate judgment, and the calmest and most charitable temper. He will have to *sound* the deep things of that spirit, which had long been brooding over the abyss of superstition and corruption, till the fountains were broken up, and the deluge went over many a fair province of Christendom, and threatened, for a time, to overwhelm temple, and tower, and pinnacle, in one wide-wasting desolation. And then he will have to watch the subsiding of the waters, and the gradual re-appearance of many a lofty fabric, which had massive strength and solidity enough to stand in the midst of the fury of that inundation. He will have to point, with exultation, to the wrecks and fragments of those perishable works of human hands, which had grown up about the walls of the city of God, and had disfigured it, and made it almost a spectacle of scorn to men and angels. And, alas! "if there be nature in him," he will look, with ruth and pity, on the yawning and deadly breaches, which, here and there, have been made in the fortresses of Zion, by the blind and indiscriminate rage of the great convulsion. If these be the views with which he, or any other man, shall approach this grand and sacred work, then may that man righteously win for himself the praise and honour of true Christian *philosophy*. But if, on the contrary, his eye shall wander over the scene of strife and confusion, only to feed itself with the spectacle of destruction,—if the chiefest of his joy shall be, to behold the wild licence of human opinion rising upon the ruins of Pontifical supremacy,—if, in short, his love for the Reformation shall be found to involve a mortal hatred for almost every thing which was known to exist before the Reformation,—then, doubtless, he may achieve a name to be wise, among them that can scarcely be said to live, but in the midst of unceasing change and instability. But, as certainly, he will deceive himself in the hope of building up the immortal fame of a *philosopher*.

For ourselves, we scruple not to declare that our poor philosophy is confounded and overborne by the bewildering rush of strange events, which have followed in the train of the great moral revolution of the 16th century. That this revolution has wrought most mightily for good, it would be ungrateful—nay, it would be sinful—to deny. And yet, we can scarcely question that a costly, and, in some respects, a truly awful price, has been exacted

for the benefits bestowed. The crisis appears to have well nigh shaken to pieces the unity and the compactness which *we* of the Anglican school have been in the habits of contemplating as one majestic attribute of the Holy Catholic Church. And this is a spectacle which we confess ourselves unable to look upon, without emotions of dismay and amazement. To us, the Scriptures of truth,—as interpreted and illustrated by the earliest history of our faith,—present the one and indivisible community of Christians, under one unvarying rule and discipline, as the grand instrument for displaying to the world the manifold wisdom and mercy of God. And yet, the season of the Church's deliverance from tyranny and imposture, appears likewise to have been the season for letting loose upon Christendom a spirit of almost universal disunion and anarchy. Then it was that the evil power of schism began to sow the wind; and fearful is the harvest which, at this hour, we are left to gather in! It would be a task too mighty for our limits,—perhaps too mighty for our strength,—to trace the causes which, by a long and labyrinthine process, have brought on a state of things apparently so much at variance with the declared counsels of God. In the midst, however, of all our melancholy searchings of heart, it best becomes us to derive from the mournful history such lessons of submission and of faith, as may keep us steadfast and unmoveable in the midst of these mysterious and perplexing dispensations. And, one consideration there is, which furnishes abundant cause, at once for humiliation, and for comfort; namely, that albeit we are forbidden to deal loosely or unfaithfully with the commandments of the Lord, yet the Lord is by no means tied and bound to the ordinances which He hath, Himself, proclaimed. It is, in truth, a saddening thing to behold the Church of this land, at any time, so languid in zeal,—so mutilated in authority, and power, and resources,—so overwhelmed by the influx of a population which had rapidly outgrown her strength,—as scarcely to be fit for the discharge of her sacred responsibilities. And yet, we fear it must be allowed that something like this was the actual condition of our Church, towards the commencement of the last century. And, herein we have abundant cause for humiliation, deep and sore. On the other hand it would really seem as if it were the Lord's pleasure to raise up good out of the fierce and lowering evil of the times—to cause the spirit of schism itself to arise and drive away the spirit of slumber which had long been descending upon the Church—to drain off, by two mighty channels, the waters of strife which were flooding the wilderness and the morass that lay beyond her means and opportunities of cultivation,—and to send forth the torrents with a cleansing and healthful effect into the midst of

the foul impurities which had been there accumulating for many a generation. And, if this were so, we, doubtless, should have reason for thankfulness and comfort. It would, indeed, be little less than madness in us to declare it an indifferent matter whether God's ark be handled by them who hold his express commission, or by them who deem any such commission to be a matter of doubtful disputation, or, perhaps, little better than a nullity. But, if it should appear to be God's will, in the exercise of his inscrutable sovereignty, in any degree to own and prosper ministrations, wilfully undertaken, and irregularly conducted,—it would surely be to fight against God, if we were to close our eyes to whatever good those ministrations might accomplish. It would rather befit us, in the spirit of humility, to search into the causes of displeasure, which had given over to another a part of the honour and reward ordained for a true, a faithful, and a laborious Church. And this train of reflection and of feeling might powerfully impress upon us a sense of our own personal unworthiness, without abating one jot of our confidence in the high and righteous claims of that Apostolic ministry, to which our clergy have been called.

At all events, we vastly prefer this sort of cautious and charitable *philosophy*, to the temper which vents itself in loud and *railing accusations* against the enthusiasm and fanaticism of the age, whenever an impetuous zeal “shoots madly from its sphere,” into some wild and eccentric trajectory of its own. We would do nothing to sanction or encourage such perilous deviations from what we believe to be the legitimate course of action. But if God sees fit to allow such violations of order,—if at any time the tide of circumstances should run so furiously as to overflow both dyke and channel,—our wisdom surely is to acquiesce in these indications of His Providence; and gratefully to recognize whatever symptoms of fertility the deluge may have left behind it. And,—with this general exposition of our views and feelings,—we proceed at once to the biography of George Whitefield, prepared for us by Mr. Philip, as he assures us, chiefly from the pen of Whitefield himself.

It appears, then, that the parents of this truly wonderful man kept the Bell Inn at Gloucester, where he was born in December, 1714; a circumstance which, he tells us, strongly excited him, in after life, to follow the example of his Saviour, who was born in the manger of a common hostelry. Like many other men of distinguished piety, he declares that the stirrings of corruption manifested themselves early in his heart. Instruction he hated. Lying, filthy talking, and foolish jesting, he was egregiously addicted to, even when very young. Stealing from his mother he thought no

theft at all, and made no scruple of taking money from her pockets before she was up. Plays, cards, and romances were his heart's delight. In short, it would be endless to recount the sins and offences of his younger days. The young man in the Gospel might declare that he had kept the commandments from his *youth up*: but, for *his* part, he confesses that, from *his* youth he had broken them all; so that, if he traced himself from his cradle to his manhood, he could see nothing in himself, but a fitness to be damned. Such, however, was the free grace of God towards him, that, in spite of the workings of corruption, he could recollect, very early, certain movings of the blessed Spirit upon his heart. Of this, he gives one very curious instance. When certain persons diverted themselves with teasing him, he immediately retired to his room; and, kneeling down, with many tears, prayed over the 118th psalm. Now it so happens that the 118th psalm is, through a considerable portion of it, sternly imprecatory. It would seem, therefore, as if the angry boy believed himself divinely moved to assuage his irritated feelings, by a vindictive application of sacred language. Surely, he can have known but little what spirit he was of, when he launched at the heads of his vexatious and teasing comrades the thunders of the awful text,—*they kept me in on every side; they compassed me about like bees; they are quenched as the fire of thorns; but, in the name of the Lord, I will destroy them!*

At this time, Whitefield was only ten years old. But, even at this early period, he was always fond of *enacting* the clergyman; and frequently used to imitate the clerical function in reading prayers, &c. He, nevertheless, remained still much addicted to petty thefts; but he silenced or bribed his conscience by giving part of his plunder to the poor, and by fixing upon books of devotion as objects of his larcenous propensities,—for which, however, he assures us that he afterwards restored *fourfold*. At the age of twelve he was placed at a school called St. Mary de Crypt, in Gloucester. And here his powers of elocution, and strength of memory, marked him out as a fit person to make speeches before the corporation, at their annual visitation. And here, too, his taste for theatrical compositions and amusements acquired additional keenness. It was not till he went to college that he was *suddenly* extricated from the snares of this sinful folly. God, upon a fast-day, was pleased to convince him. Taking up a play, to read a passage to a friend, God struck his heart with such power, that he was obliged to lay it down again.

At about the age of fifteen, his mother's circumstances being much on the decline, he began occasionally to assist her in the occupations of the public-house; till, at length, he put on his blue

apron,—washed mops,—cleaned rooms,—and became, in one word, the professed and common *drawer* of the Bell Inn, for nearly a year and a half. From this sordid and miserable servitude, however, he at last withdrew himself, and went on a visit to his elder brother, at Bristol, where he remained for two months. This, it appears, was a season of perpetual conflict between internal convictions, and the vanities of the world. He read Thomas a Kempis. He frequented the Lord's House. But, being without stated and needful employment, Satan seized on the opportunity to tempt and buffet him. Much of his time was still passed in reading plays, and sauntering about. He became solicitous to adorn his body, but altogether careless of beautifying his soul. Soon after this, he got acquainted with a set of debauched, abandoned, and atheistical youths,—took pleasure in their lewd conversation,—affected to look rakish,—and was in a fair way of being as infamous as the rest of them. If he went to public service, it was only to make sport and walk about. God, however, stopped him, when running on in a full career of vice, by giving him an unconquerable disgust for the habits and practices of his companions. This was followed by serious symptoms of reformation. He read Drelincourt “upon Death,”—went to public worship twice a-day,—and diligently studied the Greek Testament; but, nevertheless, remained unconvinced of the absolute unlawfulness of cards and plays. At last, he dreamed that he was to see God on Mount Sinai, but was afraid to meet him. The impression made by this dream was, doubtless, much strengthened by the exclamation of a gentlewoman to whom he told it,—“*George, this is a call from God.*” Thenceforward he grew more serious: but yet, hypocrisy crept into every action; and, as he once affected to look rakish, so now, he strove to look more grave than he really was. Nevertheless, in the midst of all these strivings between flesh and spirit, he was seized with an unaccountable but deep impression, that he should speedily become a preacher.

At the age of eighteen, by the assistance of some kind friends, he was entered, as a servitor, at Pembroke College, Oxford. And this event affords to Mr. Philip an opportunity of writing many bitter things, relative to the state of religion in the University, at that period; which, as our object is not controversy, we deem it best to pass over with transient notice. It is, however, worthy of remark that the Wesleys, and their associates, fare but little better, in his hands, than the men of “robes and forms.” “For any relief”—he says—“which the consciences of the “Wesleyans seem to have obtained from the death of the Son of “God, and the free salvation proclaimed in virtue of it, the Gos-

“*pel* might have been altogether untrue, or unknown. So “grossly ignorant were the whole band, at one time.—They “were *monks* in almost every thing but the name.” Whitefield, however, being then in a state of spiritual immaturity, felt his heart yearn towards the Methodists. He soon became acquainted with Charles Wesley, who put into his hands a book entitled “*The Life of God in the Soul of Man.*” And if—says his biographer—he had been left to the guidance of that book, his foot might soon have stood upon the rock of ages. But, unhappily, Whitefield was not left to follow his own convictions. Charles Wesley, as Mr. Philip assures us, being *ignorant of God’s righteousness, and going about to establish his own righteousness*, interfered with the young convert, and inoculated him with the *virus* of legality and quietism. His introduction to this school proved well nigh fatal to his life and reason. It drove him to a course of the most savage austerities. He wore woollen gloves, a patched gown, and dirty shoes. In imitation of Jesus Christ, who was carried into the haunts of wild beasts, during his temptation, he passed several hours of a stormy night in Christ Church Walk, sometimes kneeling, sometimes flat on his face. The severity of his fasts was perfectly appalling. Except on Saturdays and Sundays, he took nothing but coarse bread, and sage-tea, without sugar; and he walked out in the cold until part of one of his hands became quite black. And, in these practices he persisted, till he was scarcely able to creep up stairs. In the meanwhile, his principal study was Castanza’s “*Spiritual Combat*,” and, as it would appear, with Satan himself for its interpreter! When Castanza said *talk but little*, Satan said *talk not at all*. When Castanza advised waiting upon God, Satan told him he must leave all forms, and utterly abstain from lifting up his voice in prayer. His tutor concluded that he must be really mad: but, nevertheless, was the only person about him who treated him with real benignity and wisdom. Charles Wesley sent him to Thomas a Kempis. John Wesley referred him to the sovereign balm of quietism. His tutor lent him books, gave him money, furnished him with a physician, and behaved to him, in all respects, like a father.

But the hour of deliverance was now at hand. The remembrance of his sins began to assail him so furiously, that it drove him from Castanza and A Kempis direct to the Gospel and the throne of grace. While thus engaged in searching the Scriptures, with the aid of Bishop Hall’s *Contemplations*, he discovered the true grounds of a sinner’s hope and justification. The testimony of God concerning his Son, became *power unto salvation*. He immediately felt delivered from his burden. The spirit of heavi-

ness was taken from him. Such was his joy, that he could not avoid singing psalms, wherever he might be. The days of his mourning were ended; and the day-star arose in his heart. And thus was Whitefield rescued—as his biographer phrases it—“from the malignant snares of the devil;” in other words, from the Methodism of the Wesleyans, “whose virtues”—he tells us—“at that time, ranked no higher than the same virtues in Mahomedans and Hindoos; and amounted to no more at Oxford, than they would at Mecca or Benares.” “If”—continues Mr. Philip—“the same number of Wahabees had been about Whitefield, inculcating their simplified Islamism, who would have ascribed to them, or to it, any usefulness? Both would have been arraigned, as diverting him from the Gospel of Christ: nor would the sincerity of the Wahabees, or the self-denying character of their habits, have shielded either from severe reprehension.”

Leaving the Wesleyans and Mr. Philip to settle with each other, touching this rather unceremonious denunciation, we proceed with the narrative. Being now thoroughly enlightened as to the necessity of being justified in the sight of God, by faith only, he, in a short time, began to read to some poor people twice or thrice a week—to attend little religious societies—and to visit one or two sick persons every day. He was, further, strengthened to give a public testimony of his repentance, as to the abomination of his theatrical propensities. For, hearing that the strollers were come into the town—he was then at Gloucester—he was stirred up to an assault upon their craft; which he conducted in the form of a series of attacks in the newspaper. The thunder which he used, was Law's Treatise on the “Absolute Unlawfulness of Stage Entertainments;” which the printer consented to launch forth, in separate and successive explosions, for six weeks together. By this time, his friends became clamorous for his ordination. Whitefield, however, was vehemently reluctant. With strong crying and tears, he frequently prayed,—“Lord, I am a youth of uncircumcised lips. Lord, send me not into thy vineyard yet.” But, at length, after much internal conflict, and some external difficulties, he resolved no longer to fight against God; and, on the 20th June, 1736, he was ordained at Gloucester, by Bishop Benson, being then in the twenty-second year of his age. And thus it was, that this wandering star, which was destined to fix the gaze of European and Transatlantic Christendom, for a long series of years, was seen to issue forth from the serene and peaceful sanctuary of the Anglican Church. It appears, however, that Whitefield did not, afterwards, look back with much complacency upon this commencement of his

ministry. "It is not generally known"—says Mr. Philip—"that, although he never lost sight of his ordination vows, his views of episcopal ordination underwent such a change, that he declared to Ralph Erskine, of his own accord,—*I knew no other way, then; but I would not have it that way again, for a thousand worlds.*" From which we may collect that, if Whitefield kept his ordination vows in mind, he did so with much the same feeling that a man remembers a promise which he is resolved *not* to fulfil. His canonical engagements were a yoke which he was unable to endure; but, from which it was impossible for him forcibly to withdraw his neck, without a certain uncomfortable sense of excoiation.

No sooner was Whitefield in orders, than his passion for a locomotive and missionary course of enterprize was irresistibly called forth, by a cry for help from the other side of the Atlantic. Letters were received, about that time, from the Wesleys, then in Georgia. Their description of the moral condition of the American colonies awakened a fire within his bones, which would not suffer him to rest. He had various opportunities of clerical occupation. But, the moment the voice from Georgia reached his ears, to borrow the language of Mr. Philip, "Oxford had no magnet, Hampshire no charms, the metropolis no fascination for the young evangelist." That Whitefield did not go forth as an intruder upon the sphere of the Wesleys, appears, pretty clearly, from the following extract of a letter from John Wesley;—"only Mr. Delamotte is with me, until God shall stir up the hearts of his servants to come over and help us. What if thou art the man, Mr. Whitefield? Do you ask me what you shall have? Food to eat, and raiment to put on; a house to lay your head in, such as your Lord had not; and a crown of glory that fadeth not away." A more intelligible invitation than this, it would be difficult to imagine: and "the heart of Whitefield leaped within him, and, as it were, echoed to the call." In vain did his aged mother weep. In vain did his officious friends talk of the "pretty preferment" he might have, if he would stay at home. He was fortified in his resolution by his own prayers; and, moreover, by the opinion of the Bishop, who expressed his entire confidence that God would enable him to do much good abroad.

It was now that the prodigious powers of Whitefield, as a preacher, began to manifest themselves. His farewell sermons at Gloucester and Bristol operated with a sort of electrical force. Churches were filled on week-days as they used to be on Sundays; and, on Sundays, they were so thronged, that numbers were compelled to retire for want of room. "The word was sharper than

“ a two-edged sword. The doctrine of the *new birth* made its way, like lightning, into the consciences of the hearers.” In fact, let the peculiar doctrine have been what it might, there was, in these addresses, an intensity of spirit, an affectionate urgency of appeal, which must have wrought, at that time, with much of the influence of novelty; and, when combined with Whitefield's transcendent powers of utterance and delivery, were, of themselves, sufficient to account for much of the tumultuous agitation which ensued. It was seldom, for instance, in those days, that congregations were seized upon, and drawn upwards, by words like these: “ Come, come, my guilty brethren. I beseech you, for your immortal souls' sake, for Christ's sake, come to Christ. Methinks I could speak till midnight unto you. I am full of love towards you. Would you have me go, and tell my Master, that you will not come, and that I have spent my strength in vain? I cannot bear to carry such a message to him! I would not, indeed I would not, be a swift witness against you, at the great day of account. But, if you will refuse these gracious invitations, I must do it!” This was a tremendous, and yet a most heart-moving strain, to issue from the lips of one who was, himself, but dust and ashes,—from one, too, who as yet was but a mere youth. The people must have imagined, for the moment, that they saw before them a heavenly messenger of wrath, or love, who felt secure as to his own doom, and was solicitous only for theirs.

Previously to his embarkation, Whitefield passed some time in London. His ministry there began at the Tower. He “fulminated o'er the arsenal.” And God, he says, was pleased to give him favour amongst its inhabitants. Religious friends, from various “parts of the town, attended the word; and several young men, on the Lord's day, under serious impressions, came to converse with him on the new birth.” At this time, however, Whitefield does not appear to have contemplated London as a principal sphere of exertion. On the contrary, as Mr. Philip expresses it, the metropolis then was to him merely the way to America. He sought no engagements, and volunteered no services. But his fame had travelled before him. He was beset by solicitations to preach, especially when religious or charitable funds stood in need of reinforcement; and the moral effect, as usual, was prodigious; and, what perhaps was equally gratifying to stewards and trustees, the collections were wholly unprecedented. But popularity soon brought opposition in its train. A report was spread that the Bishop of London intended to silence him on a complaint of the clergy. What the Bishop might have done had Whitefield, at that time, commenced his

career of what Mr. Philip calls his "splendid irregularities," it would be utterly useless to conjecture. As it was, when it was understood that Georgia was to be the scene of his missionary labours, his lordship made no objection to that destination of himself, and gave him "a satisfactory answer;" upon which he took his leave. During the interval before his departure, in spite of all resistance, he found abundance of pulpits open to him; and "at length," he tells us, "having preached in a good part of the London churches, collected 1000*l.* for the charity schools, and got 300*l.* for the poor in Georgia, I left London on December 28th, 1737, in the twenty-third year of my age; and went, in the strength of God, as a poor pilgrim on board the Whitaker."

And well, it must be allowed, did the "poor pilgrim" perform his part during the passage. The voyage was perilous and distressing. And, throughout it, Whitefield was the minister of comfort to the sufferers. When the sea was rough, he went from hammock to hammock among the sea-sick, "administering sage tea and good advice." When many of the soldiers on board were taken ill, Whitefield became the nurse of his "red-coated parishioners," as he called them. During the prevalence of a fever he crawled between decks, to administer medicine and cordials to the sailors. That his attention to the spiritual concerns of his fellow voyagers was equally unwearied, is obvious from the result of his ministrations. When first he went on board he was treated as an impostor, and, in order to mark the contempt in which he was held, the vessel was turned into a gambling-house, during the first Sabbath; but, before the voyage was ended, the ship was as orderly as a church. The drum summoned to morning and evening prayers. Cards, and profane books were thrown overboard in exchange for religious books. The soldiers began to learn to read and write, and the children to repeat their prayers regularly. His farewell sermon to his "red-coated and blue-jacketed parishioners" was heard with "floods of tears;" and the passage to Georgia was, in after years, looked back upon by Whitefield as one of the brightest intervals of his life.

Early in May, Whitefield reached America; where, in spite of Wesley's formidable *sortilegium*, (dissuading him from the voyage, and declaring it to be the counsel of God that he should return to London,) he passed some months in *labours of love*, which met with the most gladdening encouragement, and so attached him to his "little foreign cure," that he could cheerfully have remained among them. It was, however, needful that he should return to London, in order to receive priest's orders, and, moreover, to collect contributions for the establishment and mainte-

nance of an Orphan House in the colony. And here we find ourselves suddenly launched forth upon the ocean of his "splendid irregularities"—his brave neglect of ecclesiastical discipline and order,—the illustrious reproach (κάλλιζον ὄνειδος), as he deemed it, of his whole future life. It would be idle for us to attempt any abstract of a tale which has been often and copiously told before. The materials are so various and abundant as to defy abridgement. We must, therefore, satisfy ourselves with such desultory remarks as are peculiarly suggested by the narrative now before us.

The impetuous and incessant movements of Whitefield's life appear, throughout, to have been governed by a marvellous simplicity of purpose. He organized no system. He was little solicitous to collect and discipline a band of auxiliaries and followers. He went forth on an almost solitary career of errant spiritual chivalry. He saw before him a frightful mass of vice, brutality, and ungodliness; and he sallied out upon a warfare against it, with the might of his own single arm; that arm, as he profoundly believed, being nerved for the conflict by the might of the living God. He entered into no historical or philosophical speculations, relative to the process by which all the evil he beheld had been heaped up. He cast forward no looks of anxious foresight to the exigencies of the future. The past was beyond human power. The future might be fitly trusted to the providence of the Almighty. The present was his sphere, not only of action, but of thought. The portentous mischiefs of the time perpetually stared him in the face; and he resolved to grapple with the monsters. This, with him, was the one thing needful. His heart was tender and benevolent. His temperament was full of fire. He became gradually conscious of a commanding influence over assembled multitudes. And, thus accomplished, he was prepared for an assault upon the gates of hell itself. His own deliverance was, in his judgment, little less than a stupendous miracle. We have seen that he could discern, in his own nature, nothing but a fitness to be damned; and yet he found himself, almost on a sudden, in possession of the peace which passeth understanding. He has repeatedly affirmed that, by natural constitution, he was an abject coward; and yet, in the cause of God, he felt himself, if we may so express it, quite *saturated* with courage; thoroughly instinct with the fortitude which bids defiance to the embattled hosts of darkness. Why then, should not the same Potentate, who had plucked the sinner from the burning, and ordained strength out of the mouth of one who was timid as a child—why should not He convert the *reed shaken by the wind* into a mighty weapon, keener than a two-edged sword? The

mercies he had experienced himself, he was impatient to see extended to others ; and, not only so, but to be honoured as the channel of that communication. Freely he had received, and freely he was resolved to give. This was the overpowering impulse which seems to have sent him forth to the streets and lanes, to the highways and the hedges ; and, to him, that impulse was as a call from heaven. In comparison with this, what were the authority, the discipline, the canons of a church ? Or what was the glory of being immortalized as the founder of a sect ? His was a *roving* commission for the salvation of human souls ; a work which spurns at the thought of parties, or monopolies. In his own estimation, *he* was the truest of all *Catholics* ; for his ambition to seek and save that which was lost, knew no limits, save those of the habitable world. And, in this spirit it was, that he passed his life in compassing both sea and land.

That this was the general tenor of his feelings and his meditations appears clearly enough from his conference at Edinburgh with the Associate Presbytery of Seceders, in 1741 ; of which he himself has left us a most interesting account. These men, we are told, were exceedingly desirous to have Whitefield all to themselves. They even refused to hear him preach, unless he would agree to join, exclusively, with them. In furtherance of their views, they were for proceeding to set him right about the matter of church government, and the Solemn League and Covenant. He replied, that they might save themselves that trouble ; for he had no scruples about the matter ; and as for preaching about the Solemn League and Covenant, it formed no part of his plan. When they reminded him that he was born and bred in England, which had revolted most with respect to church government, and that, therefore, he could not possibly be acquainted with the subject in debate ;—he said, that he had never made the Solemn League and Covenant the object of his study, being too busy about matters which he judged to be of far greater importance. In vain was it urged, that every pin of the Tabernacle is precious. The effect of this allegation upon the mind of Whitefield was like that of the thistle-down against the tempest. He said that, in every building, there were *outside* and *inside* workmen ; that the latter, at present, was his province ; that if they thought themselves called to the former, they might proceed in their own way, and he should proceed in his. He then asked them, seriously, what they would have him do ? The answer was, that he was not desired to subscribe immediately to the Solemn League and Covenant, but to preach only for *them*, till he had further light ; and the reason given for this demand was, that “they were the *Lord’s people*.” The reply of Whitefield to this opens a dis-

tinct apocalypse of his mind. He asked whether there were no other Lord's people but themselves? and, supposing all others were the devil's people, they certainly had more need to be preached to; and, therefore, he was the more determined to go out into the highways and hedges; and that if the Pope himself would lend him his pulpit, he would gladly proclaim the righteousness of Jesus Christ therein. The consequence of all this was an open breach with the Associate Presbytery; and the triumphant admission of Whitefield to the pulpits of the Kirk. For the triumph, however, he cared nothing. "He forgot equally," says Mr. Philip, "the joy of the Kirk, and the mortification of the Chapel, in seeking the triumphs of the Cross. While Churchmen were pluming themselves upon their gain, and Seceders trying to despise their loss, he was singing, with Paul, 'Now, thanks be unto God, who always causeth us to triumph in Christ, and maketh manifest, by us, the savour of his knowledge, in every place.'"

It is manifest that at this time, if the conference had been with a synod of Church of England divines, instead of a company of Scottish schismatics, he would have been ready with replies analogous to the above, if pressed with his extravagant departures from the order and discipline of the Anglican communion. He was an *inside workman*; and, therefore, far beyond the censure or controul of men who were chiefly occupied in guarding and upholding the *outside* of the building. It is true that he took his orders from the Church; and, moreover, that he continued for a time to profess his adherence to her communion. In token of this fidelity, he once went to St. Paul's with the Fetter Lane Society, to receive the sacrament. But this was, not very unreasonably, regarded as a strange sort of *adherence*, when he went from St. Paul's to Moor Fields and Kennington Common, and preached to 30,000 people! There is little doubt, we apprehend, that Whitefield's allegiance to the Church might have remained unshaken and unimpaired to the last, provided the Church would, or could, have done for him, what the Popes did for the itinerant and mendicant fraternities. Had she invested him with an exemption from episcopal controul, and an unlimited licence to intrude into the ministries of the parochial clergy, and a privilege to pray and preach when and where he would, in church or chapel, in house, or barn, or open field, he would, probably, have been as faithfully devoted to the Establishment, as the begging orders were to the Vatican. He would then have combined the advantages of ecclesiastical authority, with those of an almost unbounded liberty of action. It is obvious, for many reasons, that the Church could allow him no such amplitude of discretion. For

although her discipline has fallen into feebleness and desuetude, so that it is often difficult for her to assert her own authority, yet it would be strange, indeed, if she were to proclaim her own rules and ordinances a nullity, whenever a fiery spirit in her communion might become impatient of canonical restraint. She might find it no easy matter to visit an extravagant and irregular minister like Whitefield with any effectual interdict. And yet it is hardly to be expected that she should set much value on his professions of adherence. In this state of things, it was easy enough for Whitefield to proclaim himself an adherent to the Church, and to appeal to his readiness to preach, or pray, or communicate, in any of her consecrated fabrics. But, it is manifest that, when once he had rushed headlong into his career of magnificent eccentricity, all canonical obligations became, to him, as tow when it toucheth the fire. He was, then, an adherent of the Church, much in the same sense that he was an adherent of any sect or denomination which might be content to receive him among them, whenever he chose to come. His allegiance, in fact, amounted to neither more nor less than mere occasional conformity.

His notions of fidelity to the Church may be duly estimated from the following circumstance. At one of the associations in Wales, a motion was made, in the presence of Whitefield, for an open separation from the Establishment. He was exceedingly disturbed and grieved at the proposal; which he denounced as the work of "a few contracted spirits." By far the greater part, however, combined with him in strenuous opposition to the measure. Both he and they thought it better to go on as usual: and why?—not because the Church, as a spiritual institution, had more powerful or righteous claims, than any other religious society, to their obedience and attachment; but, simply, "because they all enjoyed such great *liberty*, under the mild and paternal government of his majesty." And what was the definition of *liberty*, propounded by him at this very association?—even "the privilege of ranging up and down, preaching repentance to those multitudes who come neither to church nor meeting; but who are led from curiosity to follow us into the fields." The truth is honestly stated by Mr. Philip: Whitefield had no fixed or definite notions respecting Church government, or Episcopal authority. He was for it, or against it, just as he conceived it to be for, or against, the work of evangelizing the country. He thought *highly* of Episcopal power, when it aided faithful preaching; and *meanly* when it hindered the Gospel. If a bishop did good, or allowed good to be done, Whitefield venerated him and his office too; but he despised both, whenever they were hostile

to truth or zeal. "And, I have no objection to add," says the biographer, "that he despised both, whenever they were hostile to his own sentiments or measures." He was, in fact, his own pope : at once the servant of servants, and the supreme and infallible judge. He very much resembled a political philosopher, who should, by turns, stand forth as the friend, or the enemy, of monarchical or democratic institutions, just as he might happen to contemplate the good or evil workings of either of those respective schemes of government.

The course of thought, by which he fortified himself in his glorious liberty, will be best learned from his own words. "There are"—he said, in one of his sermons—"but two sorts of people. Christ does not say, Are you an Independent, a Baptist, a Presbyterian, or, are you a Church-of-England man? The Lord divides the world into sheep and goats." Well—but, neither does Christ say, are you a Trinitarian, or an Arian, or a Sabellian, or a Nestorian, or a Socinian, or an Humanitarian? And yet, it would hardly have been contended by Whitefield, that it was a matter of profound indifference to which of the above divisions the hearer might belong. But logical discernment, or acute critical faculties, must not, assuredly, be reckoned among the excellences of this zealous and single-hearted man. Had he been so gifted and so accomplished, he could not have failed to discern the extreme danger of pressing too closely the language employed by our Lord, in shadowing forth the general doctrine of final retribution. For, if we are to adhere rigorously to the *letter* of that awful representation, the result must inevitably be, that, in separating the sheep from the goats, no other criterion whatever will be applied, but the performance, or the neglect, of beneficent and charitable offices.

The progress by which Whitefield arrived at the full licence of his *privilege*, as an out-door preacher, seems to have been, like all his other proceedings, extremely artless and simple. He preaches in a church. The place is crammed to suffocation. Hundreds upon hundreds are thronging the church-yard, hungering and thirsting for the bread of life. Why then should the Word be imprisoned within stone walls? Why should it not have free course, and be glorified, beneath the canopy of heaven? This point being settled, it would be no difficult matter to find abundant warrant for this grand and noble scale of operations. The Sermon on the Mount, for example, was a most sublime and glorious instance of field-preaching; for, there, the Preacher had a mountain for his pulpit, and the heavens for his sounding-board; and, when his Gospel was refused by the Jews, he sent his servants into the highways and hedges. "Besides"—said Whitefield—"I always find that I have more power in the open

air; a *proof to me*, that God is pleased with this way of preaching." It is idle to imagine that the "rotten privilege and custom" of ecclesiastical regulation could stand, for an instant, before reasonings and emotions such as these. And hence the astonishing exhibitions of Moorfields, Kennington Common, Blackheath, &c. &c. &c. John Wesley, more orderly and cautious, for a time was repelled and astounded by the somewhat dithyrambic audacity of his fellow-labourer. But he soon caught the infection: and thus, all Methodism was rocked and cradled in the whirlwind of field-preaching. The tempest, however, has now pretty well gone down: and Methodism, adult and mature, pursues a course almost as steady, and as regular, as the national hierarchy itself.

Whitefield was, now, in the condition described by Bishop Gibson, in a letter to Watts,—“From the time that men imagine themselves singled out by God for extraordinary purposes, and, in consequence of that, to be guided by extraordinary impulses and operations, all human *advice*”—he might have added, all human *restraint*—“is lost upon them.” It might have been imagined that all these symptoms of schismatical contumacy, and somewhat fanatical impetuosity, would have strongly recommended Whitefield to the Dissenters, and have brought about something like an offensive and defensive alliance between them. But it happened otherwise. In the first place, it may reasonably be doubted whether Whitefield was, at any time, very solicitous for a coalition with any other sect or party. He was, evidently, better satisfied to move in a path of his own, than to circulate round any common centre, merely as one body in a planetary system. And, secondly, it would appear that the Dissenting communities were, at that time, but ill-disposed for any cordial approximation towards the portentous wanderer. “The fact is,”—says Mr. Philip,—“that the Dissenters, of those times, were, in their own way, almost as great sticklers for *order* as the bishops. Field-preaching was as alarming to the *Board* as to the *Bench*. The Primate would as soon have quitted his throne, as a leading Nonconformist his desk, to preach from a horse-block, or a table, in the open air. Indeed, *aggression* was no part of the character of Dissent, in those days. No wonder! Dissenters had been so long persecuted, even in their secluded and obscure chapels, that they were glad to *sit still* under their vine and their fig-tree; thankful for their own safety, and neither daring, nor dreaming, to go into the high-ways or hedges. It was Methodism that made Dissent aggressive upon the strongholds of Satan. Indeed, until the chief of them were carried by storm by Whitefield and Wesley,

“ Dissenters must have dreaded all co-operation with Methodism, “ as perilous to their own peace and safety.” This is Mr. Philip’s version of the matter: and, on the whole, we deem it to be, *substantially*, just. The toleration which the Nonconformists then enjoyed must have left them at leisure for something like temperate reflexion on the history of the preceding century, darkened as it was by the mischiefs, “ great and sore,” which had been inflicted on society by the spirit which had wrought in the children of disobedience. A hurricane had, then, swept over the land, which had brought desolation in its train: and, surely, it was natural enough that a retrospect of those “ heavy times ” should produce, in reasonable men, some unwillingness to assist in, once more, untying the winds, which might chance, not only to fight against the churches, but, eventually, to disturb and endanger the conventicles, and to bring back the days of national confusion and strife. But, be this as it may, the biographer positively exults in the shyness of the Dissenters towards the new and dauntless adventurer: he says,—“ they “ would have spoiled him by their *orderliness*.” And, much in the same spirit, Ralph Erskine once declared to Whitefield that there was a manifest “ beauty in the providence of his being in “ communion with the Church of England; since, otherwise, “ such great confluences, from among them, would never have “ attended on his ministry.” Leaving, however, all these vague speculations, it may be interesting, now that the strong wind and the earthquake have subsided, to consider the result of this great convulsion. And we find that, of all the religious varieties of the present day, Methodism is the least infected with the spirit of anarchy—that its language, for the most part, is conservative and loyal—that it has not wholly lost its reverence and affection for the mother from which it sprung—and that many of its most distinguished worthies have been unable to endure the imputation of a schismatic revolt from her communion. Dissent, on the contrary,—(we grieve to say it, and we speak it with a cordial acknowledgment of many a splendid exception,)—Dissent appears, of late, to have become a sort of “ Sanctuary of Romulus;” the refuge of all who are bitter of heart, and unstable in faith; the resort of every passion which can array itself against the religious or civil institutions of the empire. That term of recent mintage, “ Political Dissent,” is, of itself, a sufficient and most melancholy indication of the present revolutionary temperament of the Dissenting body. And long may the heart of Methodism be sound enough to say to this monstrous confederacy, *My soul, come not thou into their secret; to their assembly, mine honour, be not thou united.*

But to return to Whitefield. We have lately met with a very spirited and ingenious little publication,* the object of which is to exhibit the contrast between a hearing, and a reading, age. The hearing age is that in which the passions and the imaginations of multitudes are swayed and wielded, with incredible potency, by the recitations of the rhapsodists, or the lengthened exhibitions of the drama, or the overpowering fulminations of the orator. The reading age succeeded, when books began to be multiplied; and it has reached its full ascendancy in the interval which has elapsed since the invention of printing. And marvellous indeed is the revolution which this course of things has brought about. The tumult, and the agitation, and the enchantment, of the hearing age is gone: and it has been followed by a period of calm literary enjoyment, or of sober cautious intellectual exercise, much more refined, it is true, but comparatively tame and spiritless. Books, and pamphlets, and reported speeches, now do the work which formerly was done by the fire of epic or of lyric genius, or by the tempestuous force of impassioned eloquence: and they do it in a manner almost as different, as the slow and artificial process of mere mortal agency is different from the action of that "thought-executing" element which bursts forth from the thunder-cloud. So marked is this difference, as to exhibit human society under aspects essentially distinguished from each other. Now, Whitefield lived in a reading age; but it was the singular triumph of his powers that, in the midst of the serene and almost stagnant tranquillity of the time, he revived, for a space, the stormy wonders of the hearing age. Compare him, in the midst of his thousands, or his myriads, with the occupant of a pulpit surrounded by a few quiet and, alas! perhaps, languid and half-drowsy hundreds,—and the contrast is instantly before us. For, although a modern parochial congregation is, of course, a hearing congregation, it is an assembly well-nigh destitute of the mental habits of a hearing age. They come to listen to a discourse or a lecture; which discourse or lecture, whatever may be its excellence, generally operates more after the manner of a written or printed composition, than of an address directed to the *emotive* faculties of our nature. But Whitefield was, to the crowds that thronged around him, much like what the orator of classic days was to the assembled people. He was a practised and consummate artist; and we say not this to the disparagement of his sincerity or zeal. With him, *delivery* was the first, the second, and the third excellence, in the scale of oratorical perfection. His voice was clear and sonorous. His

* Mr. Vaughan's Oration in Trinity College Chapel, Dec. 1837.

articulation was faultless. His action was singularly graceful and impressive. His countenance was full of animation and vivacity: and such was the commanding boldness and majesty of his demeanour, that it was somewhat oddly, but yet most strikingly, described, by one of his rustic hearers, who said that "he preached like a lion." His labour was unwearied in the preparation of his sermons, and, more especially, in their subsequent improvement. In short, he was transcendently gifted and accomplished, for the purpose of raising the emotions, and impressing the convictions, which *come by hearing*, and not by the slower progress of studious mental application. And—(independently of his spiritual fervour and devotion)—that individual must have been a marvellous specimen of the human race, who could thus recall, in these prosaic days, an image of the times, when the voice of one man could achieve wonders which, to us, sound all but fabulous!

Of all the testimonies borne to his astonishing powers, none is so unexceptionable and conclusive as that of Franklin; for the soul of Franklin was essentially arithmetical and prosaic. He was a cordial despiser of eloquence and all its works. And yet he himself tells us that, merely as a matter of speculation, he could not but observe the extraordinary influence of Whitefield's oratory on his hearers, and how much they admired and respected him, notwithstanding his common abuse of them, by assuring them that they were, naturally, *half beasts and half devils*. It was wonderful, he adds, to see the change made in the manners of the inhabitants. From being thoughtless or indifferent about religion, it seemed as if all the world was growing religious; so that one could not walk through the town of an evening without hearing psalms sung in different families of every street. In one well-known instance the great philosopher and patriot was, himself, compelled to "own the soft impeachment." The story, we believe, has been doubted. But it is distinctly avouched by Franklin himself; and, therefore, all scepticism about its truth is manifestly unreasonable. We allude to the occasion when Franklin happened to attend one of Whitefield's sermons; in the course of which, perceiving that it was intended to finish with a collection, he armed himself with a dogged resolution to give nothing. The contents of his capacious pouch were a handful of copper money, three or four silver dollars, and five pistoles in gold. The homily proceeded. The philosopher gradually softened; and the *copper* was destined to the collection plate. The next strain of oratory was still higher; and by it the preacher made the *silver* his own. Then came the *finale*, which was absolutely

irresistible ; and the five golden pistoles were added to the spoil.* It is hardly credible that Franklin would tell this tale if it were false. He would scarcely invent a fiction in honour of Whitefield ; for, though he deemed him a perfectly honest man, yet they had no religious connexion. Whitefield used, indeed, sometimes to pray for the conversion of Franklin, but never had the satisfaction of believing that his prayers were heard. Theirs was a mere civil friendship, which lasted until Whitefield's death. The following instance will show the terms on which they stood. When Franklin, on one occasion, offered Whitefield the accommodation of his house, he replied that if that kind offer was made for Christ's sake, it would not miss of its reward. Upon which Franklin rejoined, " Don't let me be mistaken ; it was not for Christ's sake but your sake : " on which it was jocosely remarked by an acquaintance of both parties, that Franklin had contrived to fix on earth, an obligation, which the saints were sometimes rather too apt to transfer to heaven.†

The testimony of Franklin is valuable on another account ; since it reduces almost to the certainty of calculation what must otherwise have appeared next to incredible,—namely, the immense numbers to whom Whitefield was able to make himself distinctly audible. " He might be heard and understood,"—says Franklin—" at a great distance ; especially as his auditories " observed the most perfect silence. He preached one evening " from the top of the Court House steps (at Philadelphia), which " are in the middle of Market Street, and on the west side of " Second Street, which crosses it at right angles. Both streets " were filled with hearers to a considerable distance. Being " amongst the hindmost in Market Street, I had the curiosity to " learn how far he could be heard, by retiring backwards down " the street towards the river ; and I found his voice distinct till " I came near Front Street, where some noise in that street obscured it. Imagining, then, a semicircle, of which my distance " should be the radius, and that it was filled with auditors, to " each of whom I allowed two square feet, I computed that he might " well be heard by more than thirty thousand. This reconciled " me to the newspaper accounts of his having preached to five " and twenty thousand people in the fields, and to the history of " generals haranguing whole armies ; of which I had sometimes " doubted."‡

We cannot forbear from repeating, here, another very interesting particular in Franklin's notice of this singular man ; because

* Franklin's Mem. vol. i. p. 161, &c. &c.

† Ibid. p. 165.

‡ Ibid. p. 165, 166.

it shows that he did not disdain to combine with the affectionate fervency of a messenger from God, all the legitimate and most effective artifices of a great master of oratory. "By hearing him often"—Franklin tells us—"I came to distinguish easily between sermons newly composed, and those which had been often preached in the course of his travels. His delivery of the latter was so much improved by frequent repetition, that every accent, every emphasis, every modulation of voice, was so perfectly well turned and well placed that, without being interested in the subject, one could not help being pleased with the discourse; a pleasure much of the same kind with that received from an excellent piece of music." Each of these sermons, therefore, was not *merely* a call to repentance, or an exhortation to holiness of life, or a display of the glory and the blessedness of the new birth: it was, *also*, the rehearsal of a *performance* to be afterwards frequently repeated with a constant accumulation of power. Now, all this is very much in the spirit of the ancient orators—the great masters of a *hearing* age,—and of those who, in the present day, are ambitious of emulating their transcendent excellence. With Demosthenes and Cicero every harangue was a work on which too much elaborate preparation could not possibly be lavished. True to their example, Lord Brougham transcribes, ten times over, the peroration to his celebrated speech on the trial of the Queen. And Whitefield, —though, probably, without wasting a thought upon Demosthenes or Cicero, or any of their followers, and prompted solely by his own consummate genius for public speaking,—converts each successive religious ministration into a profitable exercise of rhetoric and delivery.

With all his genius, however, it is manifest that Whitefield was deficient in those profound and capacious mental faculties which go to the composition of a mighty and immortal instructor of the human race. Of this deficiency the narrative of Mr. Philip has supplied us with one notable instance. At Lewis Town in America, he found, on one occasion, a dull, languid, and, as he calls it, an "un-affected" congregation. Nevertheless, the next day, he made the *politest* of them weep, while he pictured the trials of Abraham's faith; a favourite and efficient sermon with him. But he adds—"Alas! when I came to turn from the creature to the Creator, and to talk of God's love in sacrificing his only begotten Son, their tears, I observed, dried up. I told them of it; and could not but hence infer the dreadful depravity of human nature, that we can weep at the sufferings of a martyr, a mere man like ourselves. But when are we affected at the relation of the sufferings of the Son of God?" Now, any

one who might be conversant with the deeper philosophy of human nature would, undoubtedly, have paused before he ventured to ascribe to its "dreadful depravity" that seeming want of sensibility of which the preacher complains with so much tragic emphasis. The trial of Abraham's faith was a moving subject, precisely *because* the patriarch was "a mere man like ourselves." The scene was one purely of human sorrow. It came home to the heart of every parent in the congregation; and it is by no means wonderful that, in the hands of a painter like Whitefield, it should stir the deepest fountains of human emotion. But there is, in "the sufferings of the Son of God," something too awful, too sacred, too mysterious, for the ordinary sympathies of humanity. Tears are no fit or adequate exponents of that indescribable pathos which rushes upon the soul, when we think of the sacrifice of the only-begotten of the Father. The subject is so solemn, so overpowering, so bewildering—the event is so immeasurably distinct from every other martyrdom—the sorrows of the Son of Man so unlike all other sorrow—that, grief and compassion are almost swallowed up and lost, in wonder, and amazement, and dread. The women, indeed, who personally witnessed the sufferings of our Lord, burst forth into passionate wailing at the spectacle. But, even so, it would almost appear as if,—though kindly and tenderly,—he refused their sympathy. *Weep not for me—he cried—ye daughters of Jerusalem; but weep for yourselves and for your children.*

It was hardly to be expected that a man so constantly engaged as Whitefield in the most awful concerns of futurity, should be very accessible to the passion which, of all others, is supposed to rule most potently the course of this present life. Accordingly, we must not expect to find *Whitefield in love*. But, nevertheless, we actually do find *Whitefield in search of a wife*: and never, surely, did any human being enter upon that search less like a man of this world. The two following letters,—which are inserted as among the most precious curiosities in the whole compass of biography,—will show what pains the great missionary thought it needful to take, in order to guard against the suspicion of being at all liable to the infatuation which exercises so wide and pernicious a predominance over the human race.

"To Mr. and Mrs. D.

On board the Savannah, bound to Philadelphia from Georgia, April 4, 1740.

"My dear Friends,

"I find by experience, that a mistress is absolutely necessary for the due management of my increasing family, and to take off some of that care which at present lies upon me. Besides, I shall in all probability, at my next return from *England*, bring more women with me; and I

find, unless they are all truly gracious, (or indeed if they are,) without a superior, matters cannot be carried on as becometh the Gospel of Jesus Christ. It hath been therefore much impressed upon my heart, that I should marry, in order to have a help meet for me in the work whereunto our dear Lord Jesus hath called me. This comes (like Abraham's servant to Rebekah's relations) to know whether you think your daughter, Miss E——, is a proper person to engage in such an undertaking? If so; whether you will be pleased to give me leave to propose marriage unto her? You need not be afraid of sending me a refusal. For, I bless God, if I know any thing of my own heart, I am free from that foolish passion which the world calls love. I write only because I believe it is the will of God that I should alter my state; but your denial will fully convince me that your daughter is not the person appointed by God for me. He knows my heart; I would not marry but for him, and in him, for ten thousand worlds.—But I have sometimes thought Miss E—— would be my helpmate; for she has often been impressed on my heart. I should think myself safer in your family, because so many of you love the Lord Jesus, and consequently would be more watchful over my precious and immortal soul. After strong crying and tears at the throne of grace for direction, and after unspeakable troubles with my own heart, I write this. Be pleased to spread the letter before the Lord; and if you think this motion to be of him, be pleased to deliver the enclosed to your daughter;—if not, say nothing, only let me know you disapprove of it, and that shall satisfy, dear Sir and Madam,

“Your obliged friend and servant in Christ,

“G. W.”

“To Miss E——.

On board the Savannah, April 4, 1740.

“Be not surprised at the contents of this:—the letter sent to your honoured father and mother will acquaint you with the reasons. Do you think you could undergo the fatigues that must necessarily attend being joined to one, who is every day liable to be called out to suffer for the sake of Jesus Christ? Can you bear to leave your father and kindred's house, and to trust on him (who feedeth the young ravens that call upon him) for your own and children's support, supposing it should please him to bless you with any? Can you bear the inclemencies of the air, both as to cold and heat, in a foreign climate? Can you, when you have a husband, be as though you had none, and willingly part with him, even for a long season, when his Lord and Master shall call him forth to preach the Gospel, and command him to leave you behind? If after seeking to God for direction, and searching your heart, you can say, ‘I can do all those things through Christ strengthening me,’ what if you and I were joined together in the Lord, and you came with me at my return from England, to be a helpmeet for me in the management of the orphan-house? I have great reason to believe it is the divine will that I should alter my condition, and have often thought you were the person appointed for me. I shall still wait on God for direction, and heartily intreat him, that if this motion be not of him, it may come to nought.—I write thus plainly, because I trust I write not from any other principles but the love of God.—I shall make it my business to call on the Lord

Jesus, and would advise you to consult both him and your friends—for in order to attain a blessing, we should call both the Lord Jesus and his disciples to the marriage.—I much like the manner of Isaac's marrying with Rebekah ; and think no marriage can succeed well, unless both parties concerned are like-minded with Tobias and his wife.—I think I can call the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob to witness, that I desire 'to take you my sister to wife, not for lust, but uprightly ;' and therefore I hope he will mercifully ordain, if it be his blessed will we should be joined together, that we may walk as Zachary and Elisabeth did, in all the ordinances of the Lord blameless. I make no great profession to you, because I believe you think me sincere. The passionate expressions which carnal courtiers use, I think ought to be avoided by those who marry in the Lord. I can only promise by the help of God, 'to keep my matrimonial vow, and to do what I can towards helping you forward in the great work of your salvation.' If you think marriage will be any way prejudicial to your better part, be so kind as to send me a denial. I would not be a snare to you for the world. You need not be afraid of speaking your mind,—I trust I love you only for God, and desire to be joined to you only by his command and for his sake. With fear and much trembling I write, and shall patiently tarry the Lord's leisure, till he is pleased to incline you, dear Miss E——, to send an answer to,

“ Your affectionate brother, friend,

“ and servant in Christ,

“ G. W.”

“ It will not be wondered at, now,”—says Mr. Philip—“ that these epistles defeated their own wise purpose, by their unwise form.” It seems, however, that Whitefield, though utterly estranged from amatory weakness, was still bent upon matrimony; and that, eventually, he succeeded. The fact of his marriage is abruptly brought to our notice, not in the form of historical statement, but in the way of indirect allusion, at the opening of the XIth chapter; which begins with the remark, that “ it is a misnomer to call Whitefield's conjugal life, domestic: his engagements, like Wesley's, being incompatible with domestic happiness—as that is understood by domestic men.” From the sequel, however, we are enabled to learn that his elect lady was a widow, of the name of James, who, although once gay, was then a despised follower of the cross. There next ensues some doubtful disputation as to the fitness of the person in question to assist him in sustaining the burden of his mighty and manifold undertakings. Mr. Philip laments that he should have sought for a companion in the ranks of widowhood; and Cornelius Winter affirmed that he was not happy in his wife, and that her death set his mind much at rest. It is evident, however, that his matrimonial adventure, if not eminently felicitous, was much

more prosperous than that of Wesley; for, otherwise, he would never have spoken of his wife,—as he has done throughout a long series of letters,—in the language of kindness and esteem. They were married on the 11th of November, 1741; but, before the honeymoon was over, the bridegroom was electrifying Bristol, as in the days of old. In August, 1768, Mrs. Whitefield died; and Whitefield himself preached her funeral sermon, from the following text, which, as Mr. Philip observes, does not appear as if it had been studiously selected for the purpose of complimenting her memory;—*for, the creature was made subject to vanity; not willingly, but by reason of Him who hath subjected the same, in hope.* The issue of this marriage was one son, which was taken from them at the age of four months. There is something most deeply affecting in Whitefield's own narrative of this melancholy and trying event.

“ ‘ Who knows what a day may bring forth? Last night I was called to sacrifice my Isaac; I mean, to bury my only child and son, about four months old. Many things occurred to make me believe he was not only to be continued to me, but to be a preacher of the everlasting Gospel. Pleased with the thought, and ambitious of having a son of my own so divinely employed, Satan was permitted to give me some wrong impressions, whereby, as I now find, I misapplied several texts of Scripture. Upon these grounds I made no scruple of declaring ‘ that I should have a son, and that his name was to be John.’ I mentioned the very time of his birth, and fondly hoped that he was to be great in the sight of the Lord. Every thing happened according to the predictions; and my wife having had several narrow escapes while pregnant, especially by her falling from a high horse, and my driving her into a deep ditch in a one-horse chaise a little before the time of her confinement, and from which we received little or no hurt, confirmed me in my expectation, that God would grant me my heart's desire. I would observe to you, that the child was even born in a room which the master of the house had prepared as a prison for his wife for coming to hear me. With joy would she often look upon the bars, and staples, and chains which were fixed in order to keep her in. About a week after his birth I publicly baptized him in the Tabernacle, and in the company of thousands solemnly gave him up to that God who gave him to me. A hymn, too, fondly composed by an aged widow, as suitable to the occasion, was sung, and all went away big with hopes of the child's being hereafter to be employed in the work of God; but how soon are all their fond, and, as the event hath proved, their ill-grounded expectations blasted as well as mine! Housekeeping being expensive in London, I thought it best to send both parent and child to Abergavenny, where my wife had a little house of my own, the furniture of which, as I thought of soon embarking for Georgia, I had partly sold, and partly given away. In their journey thither, they stopped at Gloucester, at the Bell Inn, which my brother now keeps, and in which I was born. There

my beloved was cut off with a stroke. Upon my coming here, without knowing what had happened, I inquired concerning the welfare of parent and child; and by the answer found that the flower was cut down. I immediately called all to join in prayer, in which I blessed the Father of mercies for giving me a son, continuing it to me so long, and taking it from me so soon. All joined in desiring that I would decline preaching till the child was buried; but I remember a saying of good Mr. Henry, 'that weeping must not hinder sowing,' and therefore preached twice the next day, and also the day following; on the evening of which, just as I was closing my sermon the bell struck out for the funeral. At first, I must acknowledge, it gave nature a little shake, but looking up I recovered strength, and then concluded with saying, that this text on which I had been preaching, namely, 'All things worked together for good to them that love God,' made me as willing to go out to my son's funeral, as to hear of his birth. Our parting from him was solemn. We kneeled down, prayed, and shed many tears, but I hope tears of resignation; and then, as he died in the house wherein I was born, he was taken and laid in the church where I was baptized, first communicated, and first preached. All this you may easily guess threw me into very solemn and deep reflection, and I hope deep humiliation; but I was comforted from that passage in the book of Kings, where is recorded the death of the Shunammite's child, which the prophet said, 'the Lord had hid from him;' and the woman's answer likewise to the prophet when he asked, 'Is it well with thee? Is it well with thy husband? Is it well with thy child?' And she answered, '*It is well.*' This gave me no small satisfaction. I immediately preached upon the text the day following at Gloucester, and then hastened up to London, preached upon the same there; and though disappointed of a *living* preacher by the death of my son, yet I hope what happened before his birth, and since at his death, hath taught me such lessons, as, if duly improved, may render his mistaken parent more cautious, more sober-minded, more experienced in Satan's devices, and consequently more useful in his future labours to the church of God. Thus, 'out of the eater comes forth sweetness.' Not doubting but our future life will be one continued explanation of this *blessed riddle*, I commend myself and you to the unerring guidance of God's word and Spirit.'—p. 275—277.

Perhaps, of all the particulars in the history of Whitefield, there is none which will appear so utterly astounding, at the present day, as his total insensibility to that foul blot in Christian society, the institution of slavery. On his arrival in Georgia, in 1738, he found the colony in a very languishing condition; and the most desperate feature in the case was, that "the people were denied the use of *rum* and *slaves*! To place a people there, "on such a footing,"—he said,—"was little better than to tie their legs, and bid them walk. The scheme was well-meant at home. But, as too many years' experience evidently proved, it "was absolutely impracticable in so hot a country abroad." But

this is not all. When once the Orphan House was founded, Whitefield became, himself, a proprietor of slaves. Mr. Philip declares that he has seen the inventory, in Whitefield's own handwriting, of the dead and live stock belonging to that establishment : in which document, carts, cattle, and slaves, are described and valued with equal formality and *nonchalance*. In his memorial to the governor of Georgia, for a grant of lands to found a college, he urges his request by stating, that " a considerable sum of money " is intended speedily to be laid out in the purchase of a large " number of negroes." And, in his memorial to the king, praying for a charter to the intended college, he pledges himself to give up his trust, and to make a free gift of all lands, *negroes*, goods, and chattels, for the present founding, and towards the future support, of a college to be called *Bethesda*, (*the House of Mercy*.) He makes a similar appeal to the Archbishop of Canterbury ; and labours to satisfy his Grace that, by laying out only a thousand pounds in the purchase of an additional number of negroes, the income of the college would be easily and speedily augmented. Well may his biographer exclaim, *Lord, what is man !* But the instance of this prodigious inconsistency, is by no means a solitary one. It is well known that John Newton, for some considerable time after he became an awakened man, continued to sail as a mariner on board a slave-ship ; and this, too, without much molestation from the upbraidings of his conscience : a fact still more amazing than even the apathy of Whitefield ; since the occupation of Newton must have brought him perpetually into close contact with the unutterable horrors of the traffic, and of the middle passage across the sea. But, long familiarity with these legalized abominations, had blunted his perception of their infernal atrocity and cruelty. He may, perhaps, have found the employment disagreeable enough. But, it was his vocation ! It was the course of life to which Providence had called him. And, if it were wicked, it still never seems to have once occurred to him that he, a mere *operative*, could be at all responsible for its wickedness. Now, happily, all this must appear quite incomprehensible to most people, at this present time. A pious and Christian sailor serving on board a slave-ship, seems scarcely more conceivable to us, than a *serious* and *evangelical* waiter, at a gambling-house or a brothel. With regard to Whitefield, it does not appear that, to the end of his life, he was ever awakened to the infamy and horror of degrading his fellow-creatures to the level of brutes. In this respect, the preacher of glory to God and good will towards man, was scarcely a whit wiser or better than the age in which he lived. If he had lived at a later period, doubtless his heart and voice would have been

with them, who laboured, through good report and evil report, to lift off from this nation the load of that stupendous sin.

Perhaps the most interesting chapter of the present work, is the 32nd, which treats of "Whitefield's Characteristics." The biographer has here brought together, from various quarters, a multitude of particulars, most vividly illustrative of the man. In the course of this chapter, the question is started, whether Whitefield would be popular now, were he alive. And the opinion of Mr. Philip is, that his sermons would not, at this day, bring together their thousands and their tens of thousands; because the doctrine of the New Birth is, now, no longer a *novelty*, as it was then. The *novelty* of the doctrine will scarcely be denied; and this may, doubtless, have been one most powerful source of fascination and attraction. Whether it was a legitimate source, is another question. Novelty, it must surely be allowed, is, at the best, but a very questionable recommendation to any scheme of Christian doctrine. There have been times, and those among the brightest in the history of the Church, when theological *innovation* would have been called by a much more unceremonious name. But, be this as it may,—we are entirely like-minded with the author, when he affirms, that holy *energy* can never be unpopular; that holy *daring* will always wield the multitude; that natural eloquence will, for ever, find an echo in the human heart; and, consequently, that, if another Whitefield were to arise, he could scarcely fail to realize some portion of the wonders which are here recorded of his prototype. We cordially wish that we could, further, sympathise with the writer in his bright anticipation of the wonders which, as he seems to imagine, might likewise be accomplished by other preachers, if they would but keep this marvellous *exemplar* constantly before their eyes. His familiarity with such full-orbed excellence, has absolutely betrayed him into a strange extremity of intolerance. He has no patience with human mediocrity. The natural and constitutional deficiencies of them that wait upon the altar, he scruples not to stigmatize as so many moral blemishes and failures. "Let the rising "ministry"—he exclaims—"take warning. Awkwardness in the "pulpit is a sin—monotony a sin—dulness a sin—and, all of "them, sins against the welfare of immortal souls. It is as easy "to be graceful in gesture, and natural in tone, as it is to be "grammatical. You would not dare to violate grammar. Dare "not to be vulgar and vapid in manner." Alas! we greatly fear, that these solemn and sonorous denunciations will be received by many with an incredulous smile; and by others with feelings of despondency, rather than of emulation. Most deeply gratified, indeed, shall we be, if appeals like this, let them come from what

quarter they may, shall be found to stimulate any portion of our "rising ministry" to the cultivation of an eloquence worthy of the pulpit. But still, we utterly "despair the charm," as a thing of sufficient potency to banish all monotony, and dulness, and want of ease and grace from our churches. It really does appear to us, that, to achieve this consummation, would require a *regenerating* influence, almost as wonderful as that which was the perpetual theme of the mighty orator himself. Besides, we listen rather unwillingly and distrustfully to these high-wrought speculations, on another account. Their tendency is, to exalt the Pulpit too far above the Desk; to make the performance of man the very life and soul of all public worship; and thus to "turn awry the current" of our thoughts from the much more profitable exercise of still and quiet communion with God, in prayer. This, indeed, is the danger to be mainly apprehended from the contemplation of characters like Whitefield and the Wesleys. It is too apt to habituate the mind to the belief that God is chiefly, if not exclusively, to be sought in the fire, and the earthquake, and the rushing wind. It leads to the suspicion that, where there is no violent excitement—no high-toned vehemence—no mastery exerted over the passions or the fancy—there can be no devotion, no zeal, no advancement in godliness, no effective working of the spirit of holiness and consolation. And, if this persuasion should become predominant and overpowering, it needs must vitiate the whole spiritual temperament, and bring on, at last, an incurable distaste for all the sedate and tranquil offices of religion. In saying this, however, we desire not to be misunderstood. Nothing can be further from our thoughts than to speak, in terms of ungracious disparagement, of the mighty labours of these wonderful men. It is true, that, rightly to estimate, or to compare, the good, or the evil, that may have resulted from their goings forth, is a task which greatly surpasses all human sagacity and wisdom. But, even if it be granted that the preponderance of good has been unquestionably vast, it still must be remembered that phenomena, like these, are but of rare occurrence. They must be numbered among the deviations from the ordinary course of Providence. And, when they are gone by, the moral and spiritual destinies of man are left to the operation of a more uniform and peaceful agency. The revival—or the spiritual crisis—or the sudden shaking of the people—may do something towards stirring and freshening, from time to time, the stagnant atmosphere of religion. But yet, after all, it is not to these that we principally trust for the moral sanity of the world. The virtue and influence of the *still small voice* succeeds, at length, to these com-

motions. And, so long as men have an ear to hear it, we do not well to be impatient for the return of a more tumultuous season.

It has been said by some, that Whitefield's published sermons are *worthless*. *Worthless*, in one sense, they may be. We should never think of putting them into the hands of a student of theology, as a work of high authority or value. Neither should we venture to hold them up, indiscriminately, as safe models of composition, to a candidate for the Christian ministry. It is, indeed, acknowledged by one of his great admirers, Cornelius Winter, that his peculiar talents can be but faintly guessed from his printed works. *Worthless*, however, his writings are not, as specimens of that strain of preaching which, when combined with eminent powers of delivery, is fitted to arrest the attention of all classes of men—from Hume, and Bolingbroke, and Lord Chesterfield, down to the lowest ruffian of Kingswood or Moorfields. It cannot but be most instructive to examine the sort of material which was capable of being wrought up into an instrument of such surprising and almost universal power. And we doubt not that men of sound judgments and benevolent hearts, might easily derive from Whitefield's extant "*Remains*," many an useful suggestion, for the improvement of their own ministrations. For instance, what is there in the following appeal, which might not be most profitably heard from any pulpit in the Establishment :—

"Did Moses and Elias appear in glory? Are there any old saints here? I doubt not but there are a considerable number. And are any of you afraid of death? Do any of you carry about with you a body that weighs down your immortal soul? I am sure a poor creature is preaching to you, that every day drags a crazy load along. But come, believers, come, ye children of God, come, ye aged, decrepit saints, come and trample upon that monster death. As thou goest over yonder church-yard, do as I know an old excellent Christian in Maryland did; go, sit upon the grave, and meditate upon thine own dissolution. Thou mayst, perhaps, have a natural fear of dying; the body and the soul do not care to part without a little sympathy and a groan; but O, look yonder, look up to heaven, see there thy Jesus, thy Redeemer, and learn that thy body is to be fashioned hereafter like unto Christ's most glorious body. That poor body which is now subject to gout and gravel, and that thou canst scarce drag along; that poor body, which hinders thee so much in the spiritual life, will ere long hinder thee no more: it shall be put into the grave; but though it be sown in corruption, it shall be raised in incorruption; though it be sown in dishonour, it shall be raised again in glory. This consideration made blessed Paul to cry out, 'O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?' Thy soul and body shall be united together again, and thou shalt be 'for ever with the Lord.' Those knees of thine, which perhaps are

hard by kneeling in prayer ; that tongue of thine, which hath sung hymns to Christ ; those hands of thine, which have wrought for God ; those feet, which have ran to Christ's ordinances ; shall all, in the twinkling of an eye, be changed ; and thou shalt be able to stand under an exceeding and an eternal weight of glory. Come then, ye believers in Christ, look beyond the grave ; come, ye dear children of God, and however weak and sickly ye are now, say, Blessed be God, I shall soon have a body strong, full of vigour and of glory."—pp. 576, 577.

Again—which of our *masters of assemblies* might not be glad to ply the consciences and the affections of his hearers, on this wise :—

“ Did the Father say, ‘ This is my beloved Son, hear him ? ’ Then let every one of our hearts echo to this testimony given of Christ, ‘ This is my beloved Saviour.’ Did God so love the world, as to send his only begotten Son, his well-beloved Son to preach to us ? Then, my dear friends, *hear Him*. What God said seventeen hundred years ago, immediately by a voice from heaven, concerning his Son upon the Mount, that same thing God says to you immediately by his word, ‘ Hear Him.’ If ye never heard him before, hear him now. Hear him so as to take him to be your Prophet, Priest, and your King ; hear him, so as to take him to be your God and your all. Hear him to-day, ye youth, while it is called to-day ; hear him now, lest God should cut you off before you have another invitation to hear him ; hear him while he cries, ‘ Come unto me ; ’ hear him while he opens his hand and his heart ; hear him while he knocks at the door of your souls, lest you should hear him saying, ‘ Depart, depart, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels.’ Hear him, ye old and grey-headed ; hear him, ye that have one foot in the grave ; hear him, I say ; and if ye are dull of hearing, beg of God to open the ears of your hearts, and your blind eyes ; beg of God that you may have an enlarged and a believing heart, and that ye may know what the Lord God saith concerning you. God will resent it, he will avenge himself on his adversaries, if you do not hear a blessed Saviour. He is God’s Son, he is God’s beloved Son ; he came upon a great errand, even to shed his precious blood for sinners ; he came to cleanse you from all sin, and to save you with an everlasting salvation. Ye who have heard him, *hear him again* ; still go on, believe in and obey him, and by and by you shall hear him saying, ‘ Come, ye blessed of my Father, receive the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world.’ ”—pp. 578, 579.

But here, albeit reluctantly, we must break off, and conclude our somewhat miscellaneous and desultory notice with two incidents of Whitefield’s life ; the first of which shows the astonishing predominance of the spirit over the flesh, when the mind is wound up to a high intensity of action ; the other is singularly illustrative of Whitefield’s perfect self-possession and presence of mind, in the midst of stately and high-born dames. In the year 1744, while itinerating in America, he caught a severe cold, and

was brought to the gates of death. Three physicians attended him during the night. Nevertheless, in the midst of his sufferings, his chief anxiety was, to avoid disappointing the people to whom it had been announced that he was to preach the next evening:—

“ I felt a divine life *distinct* from my animal life, which made me, as it were, laugh at my pains, though every one thought I was ‘ taken with death.’ My dear York physician was then about to administer a medicine. I on a sudden cried out, Doctor, my pains are suspended: by the help of God, I’ll go and preach, and then come home and die! With some difficulty I reached the pulpit. All looked quite surprised, as though they saw one risen from the dead. Indeed, I was as pale as death, and told them they must look upon me as a dying man, come to bear my dying testimony to the truths I had formerly preached to them. All seemed melted, and were drowned in tears. The cry after me, when I left the pulpit, was like the cry of sincere mourners when attending the funeral of a dear departed friend. Upon my coming home, I was laid on a bed upon the ground, near the fire, and I heard them say, ‘ *He is gone!*’ But God was pleased to order it otherwise. I gradually recovered.

“ Gillies has added to this account an interesting anecdote, from some of Whitefield’s papers. A poor negro woman insisted upon seeing the invalid, when he began to recover. She came in, and sat down on the ground, and looked earnestly in his face. She then said, in broken accents, ‘ Massa, you just go to heaven’s gate. But Jesus Christ said, Get you down, get you down, you must not come here yet: go first, and call some more poor negroes.’ I prayed to the Lord that, if I was to live, this might be the event.”—pp. 321, 322.

The other anecdote in question, Mr. Philip tells us,

“ Was communicated by the Countess of Huntingdon to the late Barry, R. A.; and sent by him to me. I give it in his own words:—Some ladies called one Saturday morning, to pay a visit to Lady Huntingdon, and, during the visit, her Ladyship inquired of them if they had ever heard Mr. Whitefield preach? Upon being answered in the negative, she said, ‘ I wish you would hear him, he is to preach to-morrow evening at such a church or chapel,’ the name of which the writer forgets (nor is it material): they promised her Ladyship they would certainly attend. They were as good as their word; and upon calling on the Monday morning on her Ladyship, she anxiously inquired if they had heard Mr. Whitefield on the previous evening, and how they liked him? The reply was, ‘ O my Lady, of all the preachers we ever heard, he is the most strange and unaccountable. Among other preposterous things, (would your Ladyship believe it?) he declared that Jesus Christ was so willing to receive sinners, that he did not object to receive even the devil’s *castaways*. Now, my Lady, did you ever hear of such a thing since you was born.’ To which her Ladyship made the following reply: ‘ There is something, I acknowledge, a little singular in the invitation, and I do not recollect to have ever met with it

before ; but as Mr. Whitefield is below in the parlour, we'll have him up, and let him answer for himself.' Upon his coming up into the drawing-room, Lady Huntingdon said, ' Mr. Whitefield, these ladies have been preferring a very heavy charge against you, and I thought it best that you should come up and defend yourself : they say, that in your sermon last evening, in speaking of the willingness of Jesus Christ to receive sinners, you expressed yourself in the following terms,—' that so ready was Christ to receive sinners who came to him, that he was willing to receive even the devil's castaways.' Mr. Whitefield immediately replied, ' I certainly, my Lady, must plead guilty to the charge ; whether I did what was right or otherwise, your Ladyship shall judge from the following circumstance. Did your Ladyship notice, about half an hour ago, a very modest single rap at the door ? It was given by a poor, miserable-looking, aged female, who requested to speak with me. I desired her to be shown into the parlour, when she accosted me in the following manner :—' I believe, Sir, you preached last evening at such a chapel.' ' Yes, I did.' ' Ah, Sir ; I was accidentally passing the door of that chapel, and hearing the voice of some one preaching, I did what I have never been in the habit of doing, I went in ; and one of the first things I heard you say, was, that Jesus Christ was so willing to receive sinners, that he did not object to receiving the devil's castaways. Now, Sir, I have been on the town for many years, and am so worn out in his service, that I think I may with truth be called one of the devil's castaways : do you think, Sir, that Jesus Christ would receive me ?' Mr. Whitefield assured her there was not a doubt of it, if she was but willing to go to him. From the sequel it appeared that it was the case, and that it ended in the sound conversion of this poor creature ; and Lady Huntingdon was assured, from most respectable authority, that the woman left a very charming testimony behind her that, though her sins had been of a crimson hue, the atoning blood of Christ had washed them white as snow."—p. 509—511.

One parting word to Mr. Philip. Although he belongs to a school widely different from our own, we are profoundly convinced that the cause of religion, *pure and undefiled*, is close to his very heart. We would, therefore, respectfully request of him to consider whether, on one or two occasions, he has not, for a moment, lost sight of the seriousness and the sobriety demanded by the sacred realities which his theme involves. For instance—we hope not to be condemned for morbid or fastidious sensibility, touching such matters, if we express a grave doubt whether one of the most awfully impressive representations in Scripture ought to have been exhibited in combination with an image approaching to the ludicrous, as in the following passage. Speaking of the Orphan-House in Georgia, he says, " It compelled him (Whitefield) to travel, and it inspired him to preach. It was his *hobby*, certainly. But, by riding it well, he made it, like the *White Horse* of the Apocalypse, the means of going forth

"conquering, and to conquer." If Mr. Philip will only turn, once more, to the 19th chapter of Revelations, and read from verse 11th to verse 16th, inclusive, he will instantly perceive how much that tremendous description is degraded by the above association. Again, we suspect that Whitefield himself, if he were now living, would remonstrate with his encomiast for speaking of him as "the *Peter* of England's Pentecost." He may, like other mortals, have had his weaknesses. He may have had his occasional fits of rather proud humility; as when he exclaimed, "Why me, Lord, why me?" He may, at times, have been impatient for the honours of such persecution and martyrdom as were to be had in an age of freedom and toleration. But, unless he was much more inflated with spiritual arrogance than we ever supposed him to be, he would, we should imagine, have been ready almost to rend his garments, on beholding himself thus elevated to a level with the Apostles! We feel, however, no satisfaction in dwelling on inadvertencies like these. We shall accordingly finish, by declaring that, whatever may be Mr. Philip's qualifications for the task of a philosophical historian, he has, at all events, in our humble judgment, done the office of a faithful and interesting biographer.

ART. II.—1. *The Primitive Doctrine of Election; or an Historical Inquiry into the Ideality and Causation of Scriptural Election, as received and maintained in the Primitive Church of Christ.* By George Stanley Faber, B.D. &c. Crofts: London, 1836.

2. *The Doctrine of Election, and its Connection with the general Tenor of Christianity, illustrated from many parts of Scripture, and especially from the Epistle to the Romans.* By Thomas Erskine, Esq., Advocate. Duncan: London, 1837.

THERE is no surer guide to the discovery of the true doctrine of Scripture, so far at least as that doctrine depends upon the proper meaning of words, than an intimate acquaintance with the opinions of the Primitive Church. As the language of the New Testament bears a reference, more or less direct, to the institutions of the older economy, as held by the patriarchs and expounded by the prophets, it might be presumed, on that ground alone, that the terms employed by Jewish converts, such as constituted the first flock of Christ, would be best understood by those to whom the doctrines of the Rabbis, at the era of the

Advent, were most familiar. It is a remark of the learned Dodwell, that the writings of St. Paul cannot be fully explained, except by assuming the principle that he often expressed himself *ex mente Phariseorum*; and that his views concerning predestination, foreknowledge, election, and the Divine decrees, in general, must be considered through the medium of the school in which he received his education. But without laying too much stress on this observation, it will be readily admitted by every competent judge, that the Primitive Church is its own best interpreter; that the proximity of the first believers to the times of the Apostles, gave them great advantages for becoming acquainted with the import of words, as used by those inspired servants of the Redeemer; and hence, if a doctrine was unknown to the faithful, in the beginning of the second century, we may conclude that it was not taught either as an article of belief or as a motive to good living.

The Calvinistic notion of election has often been most triumphantly refuted on the ground of scriptural interpretation, and even by an appeal to those feelings of truth, justice, and mercy implanted in the human breast, which, in their unsophisticated state, constitute at once a revelation of the Divine will, and a law whereby are sanctioned the original determinations of the intellect as to moral good and evil. But there was still wanting the historical proof that the tenet in question made no part of the evangelical system once delivered to the saints, and that it cannot be traced beyond a certain period to which the authority of apostolical teaching did not come down, and where of course it must rest exclusively upon the professional knowledge or ingenuity of an individual author. This desideratum is supplied by Mr. Faber, who, after minutely examining the works of all the Fathers prior to Augustine, affords to his readers the most perfect assurance that, down to the fifth century, the Church of Christ never gave any countenance to the strange system of opinions advanced by the Bishop of Hippo. The primitive Christians, he reminds us, *must* have annexed *some* ideas to the scriptural terms Election and Predestination; and when we recollect that they must have received their doctrinal instruction either from the Apostles themselves, or from those who were taught by the Apostles, "it is difficult to believe, that they could have annexed to them any other ideas than those which were annexed to them by their inspired, and therefore infallible teachers." What these primitive notions really were he sets forth at great length, and with much strength of argument; but before we can undertake to make our readers acquainted with the train of thought along which they are conducted to the important con-

clusions wherein the reasoning terminates, it will be necessary to explain two or three of his phrases.

This laborious and learned work professes to be an "Historical Inquiry into the *Ideality* and *Causation* of Scriptural Election." Suffice it, then, to say that *Ideality* expresses the import of the privileges, benefits, or blessings which are comprehended in election; and that *Causation* refers to the motive or object in the Divine Mind whence the act of election proceeds. The one, in short, denotes the thing, and the other the moving cause which led to it. Again, the author divides the hypotheses which have been entertained on the subject of Election into three classes—Calvinism, Arminianism, and Nationalism. The two former require no explanation; and, as to the last, it may be enough to say, that it designates the theory of Locke, Whitby, and Taylor, who assert that the term election, in the Old Testament as well as in the New, applies only to the choice or separation of a whole people or large bodies of men, to constitute a visible Church, and to enjoy the privileges attached to it. Mr. Faber declares that, in the early ecclesiastical writings, "neither Calvinism, nor Arminianism, nor Nationalism could, as systems combining severally a well-defined scheme of *Causation* with a well-defined scheme of *Ideality*, be anywhere discovered."

"While in the course of my researches I was struck with perceiving *negatively* that, in the early writings of the Church, not a vestige of those systems, *as systems*, could be discovered; I was also struck with perceiving *positively* that yet a fourth system, essentially different from all the three, in point either of *Ideality* or of *Causation*, or of both *Ideality* and *Causation*, was, by the earliest Church Catholic, received and delivered, as exhibiting the true sense and manner in which the scriptural terms *Elect* and *Predestinate*, or *Election* and *Predestination*, ought to be explained and understood. At what precise time the system now denominated Arminianism arose, I am unable to say. It was received among the schoolmen anterior to the Reformation; but in point both of *Ideality* and *Causation*, it was utterly unknown to the strictly earliest Church, or the Church down to about the end of the second century. As little am I able to specify the commencement of the system which I have distinguished by the appellation of Nationalism, if Locke were not its original author. Some specious passages in its favour, by which I mean *in favour of its ideality*, may doubtless be produced from the writings of the ancient Fathers, though Locke does not profess to avail himself of their evidence; but when these passages are carefully examined, they will prove to give no support to the system in question. Calvinism, on the contrary, has its commencement marked with an uncommon degree of precision. Wishing fairly to come to the bottom of the matter, and well aware that Augustine had taught the system long before the days of the celebrated Calvin, I employed my first season of leisure in carefully perusing the whole Pelagian contro-

versy of that eminent Father ; during the course of which, and specially toward the conclusion of it, he is known to have copiously stated, and to have vigorously maintained, the system now under consideration. The result was precisely what I had anticipated from my previous reading of the *earlier* Fathers. When Augustine fully propounded his own views of *Election* and *Predestination*, he was immediately charged with innovating upon the ancient doctrine of the Church ; he was assured by the complainants that they had never before heard of such speculations ; he was referred to the current system of the existing Catholic Church ; and he was challenged to produce evidence that his new opinions had ever been advanced as the mind of Scripture by any of his ecclesiastical predecessors."

The method adopted by Mr. Faber in the prosecution of his argument, resembles that of which Bilson set the example when reasoning with the Puritans on Church government. Cartwright, following in the steps of his master Calvin, thought proper to maintain the Divine institution of a lay eldership, relying on the accuracy of the exposition hazarded by the school of Geneva, as applied to the often-quoted passage in the first epistle of St. Paul to Timothy, " Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, especially they who labour in the word and doctrine." From these words it was inferred, that the Apostles had authorized an order of men to govern the Church who had no commission to administer the word and sacraments. Their function was supposed to be confined to ecclesiastical discipline. Archbishop Whitgift, who wrote an answer to Cartwright's " Admonition," knew not how to get over this apparent authority drawn from the Scriptures, and therefore frankly acknowledged that, in the days of the Apostles and for some time after, the Church was under the government of these lay elders. Dr. Bilson, regretting this concession on the part of a prelate who held so distinguished an office in the Anglican Establishment, resolved to reconsider the grounds on which the conclusion was made to rest. Upon recurring to the first ages of Christianity, he found that, in no time or place mentioned by any class of writers, was there any evidence that there ever had been an order of lay-presbyters. It seemed strange that, if such a class of men everywhere governed the Church under the Apostles, no council, history, or father, should ever so much as name them, or allude to them, or even give to the words of St. Paul the meaning which Calvin claimed for them. He found that many learned and ancient Fathers had examined and sifted the import of the words, 1 Timothy, v. 17, and not one of them ever so much as surmised that any such thing was in the mind of the inspired author. Chrysostom, Jerome, Ambrose, Theodoret, Primasius,

Œcumenius, Theophylact, and divers others, had studied and expounded this text, and never dreamed of any lay-presbytery to be mentioned in them. “If then,” says Bilson, “the words of St. Paul stand fair and clear, without this late device, as in the judgment of these ancient and learned writers they do, what reason, after fifteen hundred years, to entertain a new platform of governing the Church by laymen, upon a bare conceit that the words of St. Paul may sound to that effect.” He then shows in what sense St. Chrysostom and other Greek writers understood them; namely, “that as, in a minister of the Word, good life, good government, and good doctrine are required; the two first are commended, but painfulness in the word is chiefly to be preferred in men of their calling: and so it was not two sorts of elders, but two parts of the pastoral charge that were implied in the apostolical advice.”

On a similar principle the author of *The Primitive Doctrine of Election* refutes the notions of the Calvinist relative to this important tenet; showing that the Fathers of the primitive Church were not acquainted with any such article of belief; that it was not taught as an institute of the Gospel; that the disciples of the Apostles were entirely ignorant of it; and that for three centuries after the death of St. John it was not communicated to the faithful as a part of the truth that is in Jesus. But Augustine, in his own defence (for, as we have seen, he was charged with innovation), maintained that he set forth no new scheme of doctrine; on the contrary, that he faithfully delivered to posterity that which he had received from those who lived before him. This declaration, however, was not deemed satisfactory, nor was it received with the submission to which his rising fame might have seemed to entitle him. The Christians resident in the southern parts of Gaul, communicating with him through Prosper and Hilary, did not conceal their surprise and disappointment that he should have published opinions at once so new and so startling on one of the most interesting subjects connected with their faith as servants of the Redeemer:—“We heartily approve of your general confutation of Pelagius and his followers: but why do you superfluously mingle with it a system of novel peculiarities, which we cannot receive? To say nothing of what we at least deem the utter inconsistency of that system with Scripture, it is in truth quite new to us. We never even so much as heard of it before; we find it unsanctioned by any one of the preceding Fathers; and we perceive it to be contrary to the sense of the whole Catholic Church. Be assured, however, that, *this one matter excepted*, we cordially admire your holiness, both in all your doings and in all your sayings.”

Here was a plain and distinct challenge on a specific point—the *novelty* of his doctrine as to Predestination and the Final Perseverance of the Saints. He denied that the doctrine was new; and how did he prove his negation? He admits that the Church was not wont to bring forward, in her public ministrations, the article of Predestination; because, in former times, she had no enemy to encounter, no gainsayer to convince; but he adds that, notwithstanding this habitual silence on the topic in question, she *must* always have held the doctrine, because she has always prayed that unbelievers may be converted to the faith, and that believers may “persevere to the end.” With respect, again, to the more ancient Fathers, he adduces out of their whole number only three,—Cyprian, Gregory Nazianzen, and Ambrose; and, on the warrant of a few expressions selected from their works, he pronounces that they all teach his system of Predestination with the utmost harmony. Let us weigh their evidence, as prepared for this test, by the diligence of our author.

Of the three divines on whom Augustine relies, Cyprian, the earliest of them, did not flourish till about the middle of the third century. The two others lived during the latter part of the fourth century; and hence, had this testimony been altogether satisfactory, we should still have had only a meagre list of three witnesses, the first of whom did not exist till more than a century and a half after the Apostolic age. But, in truth, the witness of Cyprian and Gregory is so utterly irrelevant, that it is surprising it should ever have been brought forward; while the citations from Ambrose, when properly considered, will be found little more to the purpose. We have already alluded to the prayer of the Bishop of Carthage, that infidels might be converted, and that such as believed might persevere unto the end; from which words Augustine infers that this pious prelate *must* have held his sentiments respecting Election and Reprobation. Gregory, again, exhorting his flock to confess the Trinity in unity, assured them that “He who enabled them, in the first instance, to believe that doctrine, would in due time also give them power to confess it.” Therefore, the Bishop of Hippo concludes that his views of Predestination and Election must have been held by Nazianzen. Finally, Ambrose argued that when a man became a Christian, he might fairly allege his own good pleasure in so doing, without in any wise denying the good pleasure of God; “for it is from God that the will of man is prepared; and Christ calls him whom he pities.” From this statement it is concluded by Augustine, that the writer of it must have embraced notions similar to his own, on the decrees of God and the destiny of man.

But another passage has been cited from the same author, which, dislocated from the text, and considered without respect to the avowed sentiments of Ambrose, may seem at first to be somewhat more pertinent. This learned Father, commenting on a remark made incidentally by St. Luke, expresses himself as follows:—"Learn also that Christ would not be received by those who, he knew, had not been converted in simplicity of mind. For if he had so pleased, he might, from being undevout, have made them devout. But why they did not receive him the evangelist himself shows us, when he says, 'because his face was as though he would go to Jerusalem. For the disciples were wishing to be received into Samaria.' God calleth those whom he designs to call; and him whom he willeth he makes religious."

"On this insulated passage, associated with that which I have already noticed as being perfectly inapposite and impertinent, rests Augustine's entire proof, that Ambrose agreed with him in his peculiar views of Election and Reprobation. For let it not be forgotten that the challenge of the Massilean Christians to Augustine was, not to demonstrate by evidence the primitive antiquity of the doctrines of Grace, but to demonstrate by evidence the primitive antiquity of his own well-defined specialties. Nor even in the place before us, nakedly standing as it does, I know not that Ambrose says any thing to which a sound maintainer of the vital doctrines of Free Divine Grace and Corrupt Human Insufficiency would not readily subscribe. A Calvinist or Austinist, no doubt, would of course assent. But it by no means *therefore* follows, that every one who does assent, stands thereby pledged to be a Calvinist or an Austinist. The propriety of this remark, which obviously involves the evidential irrelevancy of the present citation, will soon appear, if quitting our insulated and doctrinally indefinite passage, we simply and briefly compare the system of Augustine with the *real* sentiments of Ambrose, as from his own writings those sentiments may be readily collected.

"Augustine taught the *absolute Election of certain individuals to Eternal Salvation*. In other words, Augustine taught that God has irrevocably elected certain individuals to eternal salvation, simply *because* such a proceeding seemed good to his sovereign will and pleasure. Ambrose taught the *conditional* election of the Gentiles into the pale of the visible Church. In other words, Ambrose taught that God has elected certain individuals out of the great mass of the unbelieving Gentiles into the pale of the visible Church, *because* he foresaw the future merits and fitness of those individuals. Whence he consistently maintained that the character of an Elect Race, a Royal Priesthood, a Holy Nation, an Adopted People belongs in common to all the members of the visible Church Catholic. Such were the respective systems of Augustine and Ambrose. No two Theological Schemes, I apprehend, whether in point of *ideality* or in point of *causation*, can well be more different; and I must say that Augustine's adduction of Ambrose as an authority for his

own peculiar views of Election, is, if we be charitably willing to exempt him from the charge of intentional disingenuousness, at the least, strangely nugatory and irrelevant."

It is amusing to see how Calvin avails himself of the device practised by his great master, the Bishop of Hippo-Regius, for gaining to his cause the weight of Ambrose's name. He does not, indeed, venture to appeal to any writer older than Augustine, and even seems quite sensible that two out of the three authors quoted by this Father are nothing to the purpose. With his eyes open to all the advantages and importance of having antiquity on his side for aiding him in the establishment of his hypothesis, he nevertheless relinquishes Cyprian and Gregory. He saw clearly that his predecessor in the doctrine of Christian fatalism, had laid hold of these commentators as a drowning man catches at a straw, and therefore he himself makes no mention of them. But he seizes the alleged evidence of the Bishop of Milan, and uses it, too, with much more complacency than fairness. Let the testimony of Augustine, says he, avail with those who willingly acquiesce in the authority of the Fathers: although Augustine does not suffer himself to be disjoined from the rest: but by clear testimonies shows that any such discrepance from them as that with the odium of which the Pelagians attempted to load him, is altogether false. For out of Ambrose he cites *Christus, quem misereatur, vocat*. Item, *Si voluisset, ex indevotis fecisset devotos. Sed Deus, quos dignatur, vocat; et, quem vult, facit religiosum*.

In this statement there is, as our author well remarks, double dishonesty. Calvin assures those who are inclined to build on the authority of the Fathers, that Augustine is not disjoined from the rest; and that he was never accused of any discrepancy from the current of primitive belief except by those heretics the Pelagians. By the former assertion he unquestionably meant to insinuate that all antiquity, up to the Apostolic age, spoke the language and advocated the peculiarities of Augustine; and by the latter, he more covertly conveys the impression that the only charge brought against his favourite author, as an innovator on evangelical truth, was made by a sect whose errors he had exposed and whose resentment it was an honour to have incurred. Now, it assuredly requires no small portion of that charity which thinketh no evil to acquit the Geneva professor of intentional misrepresentation. He was perfectly aware, while he claimed for the African prelate a concurrence in opinion with all the more ancient Fathers of the Church, that not one of them, with the exception of Ambrose, could be shown to have written a single sentence capable of being even twisted into a conformity with his daring novelties. And

when he referred to the Pelagians as attempting to load the bishop with the odium of singularity, of standing alone in the wide field of Christian learning and faith, and of having no example or support during the lapse of four hundred years, he could hardly be ignorant that the persons who really did remind Augustine that he was bringing new things to light, were those orthodox servants of Christ, who extolled his zeal and magnified his triumph in his contest with the disciples of Pelagius! Calvin, we fear, is in this instance justly chargeable with an artful misrepresentation of the truth.

The fruitless attempt to press Ambrose into the service of a cause to which his general sentiments were greatly opposed, seems on some occasions to have thrown back Augustine on his own resources, and to have drawn from him the acknowledgment that his theory of Redemption was really new. So far from maintaining that his notions on the subject of Election had descended to him from antiquity through the medium of his professional instructors in the Faith, he states that he had himself diligently searched out and discovered it. He owns there was a time when he had not attained to the knowledge of the truth according to his peculiar views; when he neither made the search nor the discovery; and consequently he conducts his readers to the inference that there was a time when he maintained an entirely different system. Now, it is manifest that this never could have happened, if from the first his theory of belief as to Predestination and Election had always been the one generally recognized by the Catholic Church.

The modesty, reserve, or polemical skill of Calvin have not been exhibited by all his followers in modern times. Seeing that the founder of his faith had appealed without reason to Cyprian and Gregory, he passed them by in his review of ancient authorities. But Mr. Milner, in a certain part of his Church History, strengthens the ranks of Austinism by dragging to its banners two ancient writers whose opinions have never been considered as in the slightest degree allied to those first promulgated at Hippo-Regius. We allude to Clement of Rome and Ignatius of Antioch, who are represented by this semi-Calvinist as having paved the way for the introduction of that sound creed which was fully matured in the sixteenth century on the banks of the Leman Lake. We are assured by Mr. Milner that the strictly primitive Church, which received her theology immediately from the lips of the Apostles, held the doctrine of Election as that doctrine has been subsequently explained by Augustine and Calvin. In support of this bold asseveration he gives from St. Clement the following paraphrase. "Let us go to Him in sanctification of heart, lifting up

holy hands to Him, influenced by the love of our gracious and compassionate Father, who by *his election hath made us his peculiar people*. Since therefore we are the *elect of God*, holy and beloved, let us work the works of holiness." The original terms do not in all respects bear out the translation, as will be seen by comparing $\delta\varsigma \epsilon\kappa\lambda\omicron\gamma\eta\varsigma \mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\varsigma \epsilon\pi\omicron\iota\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu \epsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$, with "who by his election hath made us his peculiar people." Still, it is maintained that the doctrine of Election runs remarkably through it. The passage from Ignatius is the address or salutation contained in his letter to the Church of Ephesus, which he there describes as predestinated before the world, $\pi\rho\delta \alpha\iota\omega\acute{\nu}\omega\nu$, to permanent and unchangeable glory, and elect by the will of the Father and Jesus Christ our God. From this address Mr. Milner concludes that the "Ephesian Christians had still maintained their character for Evangelical purity; that the very titles by which they are accosted by the Bishop of Antioch demonstrate what their faith was in common with that of the whole church at that period; and abundantly show the vanity of those whose dislike of the peculiar truths of Christianity induces them to suppose that the ideas of Predestination, Election and Grace were purely the systematic inventions of Augustine and were unknown to the primitive Christians." He adds, "we are certain that St. Paul's Epistles, and particularly the one addressed to this Church, are full of the same things."

Now, from these extracts we may learn, if we knew it not before, that Clement and Ignatius use the terms "predestinate," "elect," and "election;" but in what particular sense they use them, remains still to be determined. That they are employed by these primitive writers in the Calvinistic acceptation is assumed, indeed, by Mr. Milner; and then the assumption is farther extended into the semblance of an historical evidence; whence, in the third place, a corollary is derived that the Augustinian doctrine of Election was, from the very beginning, taught by Clement of Rome as the familiar and universally received tenet of the earliest Catholic Church. It is ascertained by Mr. Faber, that in the Epistle of the Bishop of Rome to the Corinthians, the terms in question occur only nine times; and by weighing their import, with a due reference to the context and to the main object which the author had in view, it is made perfectly manifest that in his hands, they had not the meaning which was afterwards assigned to them by the founder of the school of Hippo-Regius. The latter set forth as an institute of the Christian religion, the sovereign election to eternal life of certain individuals, not only out of the unbelieving world at large, but likewise out of the various members of the visible Church itself.

But Clement, by the very form of his language, shows us that he considered *all* the members collectively, both of the Church of Rome and of the Church of Corinth, to be a part of the great body of God's elect: for, be it observed, the epistle is addressed to the *whole* Church of Corinth in the name of the *whole* Church of Rome; and the plural terms *we* and *us* abundantly indicate that in his sense of the word, the term *elect* was descriptively appropriate to *every* member of the Church Catholic. Such an extension of the word precludes the supposition that the companion and fellow-labourer of the Apostles could understand by election a direct and irreversible determination to eternal life; for, had he so understood it, he must have believed, what yet he could not have believed, that not a single member of the Church universal would perish. Election, in his eyes, was not an infeasible admission to the kingdom of heaven, but an adoption through Christ to be a peculiar people as the Israelites were adopted collectively to be a peculiar people. "Hence," he says, addressing the whole body of the Corinthians, "let us therefore approach unto the Lord in holiness of soul, lifting up to him holy and unpolluted hands, loving our clement and merciful Father, who hath made us unto himself a part of the election." For thus it is written: "When the Most High divided the nations, as he scattered the sons of Adam, he appointed the boundaries of the nations according to the number of the angels. Then his people Jacob became the portion of the Lord, Israel the lot of his inheritance." And, in another place, he says, "Behold, the Lord taketh unto himself a nation from the midst of the nations, as a man taketh the first fruits of his threshing-floor; and out of that nation shall come the Holy of Holies. Wherefore, since *we are made a part of the Holy One*, let us do all those things that pertain unto holiness."

From this statement it is manifest, beyond all reasonable contradiction, that, according to the views of St. Clement, the election propounded in the Gospel was the same as the election of the Israelites under the law to be God's peculiar people, as distinguished from the various nations of the pagan world, which were pretermitted or passed by. The same conclusion may be drawn from the language and reasoning of Ignatius, into whose mind the Augustinian notion of predestination seems never once to have entered.

It has been remarked that, in one particular only, is there any semblance of disagreement between the Bishop of Hippo and the President of Geneva, the doctrine, namely, of Regeneration. Calvin held, that the grace of regeneration is granted *solely* to the elect, and consequently maintained, that those who are regene-

rated *cannot* finally fall away to perdition. The other taught that *all* infants are regenerated in baptism: and because persons baptized in their infancy may perish, he likewise taught that the regenerate may finally fall away to their everlasting ruin. The former regarded regeneration as a *moral* change of disposition, superadded to a *federal* change of condition; and this he understood to take place in the elect, and in the elect only, at the time of their effectual calling. But the latter, in the case of infants, viewed regeneration only as a beneficial change of relative condition; in other words, as removing the imputed guilt of original sin, and as bringing them out of the wilderness of the unbelieving world into the pale, and covenanted privileges, of Christ's Church. Yet, since, in his opinion, and in necessary accordance with his train of reasoning, regeneration, in the case of infants, neither is nor can be a moral change of disposition, he thence contended, that although all baptized infants must be accounted regenerate, still, in order to their salvation, they must at some time *after* their baptism, experience that moral change of disposition which hitherto they have not experienced. Now, to use Mr. Faber's argument as applicable to this case, as all who are to be saved must, at some period or another, experience this moral change, which Augustine denominates conversion; and since, in the bishop's view of the matter, infants do not experience this change in their baptismal regeneration, indispensable though it be to their eternal welfare; he must necessarily be understood as teaching that the regenerate, in *his* sense of the word, may fall away irretrievably, and thus finally perish. In effect, therefore, though the notions of Augustine may at first sight appear to be more sound than those of Calvin, they differ not materially; and, in both, the source of error is the same, a want of attention to the primitive doctrines of the Church relative to regeneration and election.

It is well observed, by an able writer, that the matters which come under our especial consideration as Christians, are not the naked offspring of human reason, exercising itself upon the subjects which concern its eternal interests, but are truths revealed to us by God himself, with this especial promise, that he will be with his Church in all ages, so that the gates of hell shall not prevail against the *great* truths of the Gospel. It therefore becomes of unspeakable importance, that we should know *what* truths have been held by the Church in *all* ages, because their general acceptance, combined with the remembrance of God's promise, makes them binding on us. Whatever in religion is *new*, is, *eo nomine*, *false*. Whatever in the strict sense of the word is *old*, that is, what has been handed down from the Apos-

tolic times through the lapse of ages to us, that is, *eo nomine*, true.*

As neither Calvinism nor Arminianism derives any countenance from primitive antiquity, it became an important question to ascertain what were the precise notions attached to the term election in the days of the Apostolic Fathers. Proceeding on the analogy of Scripture, both of the Old Testament and the New, there can be no doubt that this expression was applied to the choice of certain individuals out of all nations, to constitute the visible Church of God, and to enjoy the privileges connected with this holy vocation; and farther, that such choice was made with the merciful purpose that, through faith and holiness, they should attain to everlasting life, though not exempted from the hazard of failing, owing to their neglect or perverseness to make their calling and election sure. As this principle is not limited to one peculiar lineage, but extends to all men, it is by Mr. Faber denominated Nationalism; a term founded on the usage of Mr. Locke and his followers, who have not sufficiently restricted the import of their language, with regard to what our author would call the ideality of election. Mr. Faber has, accordingly, substituted the phrase "ecclesiastical individualism," implying that individuals, not whole nations, were chosen to become members of the Church. For instance, as he observes, the early Christians supposed not the Greeks *collectively* to be an elected nation, as contradistinguished from other nations, which were not elected; but they viewed as the elect *among* the Greeks those individuals who, obeying the Gospel call, had become members of the Church of Christ, whether seated at Corinth, or at Ephesus, Colosse, Philippi, or Thessalonica. Hence they esteemed the Catholic Church at large to be the Church of the Election, as comprehending the whole body or people of the elect gathered individually out of every nation upon the face of the earth.

From this view of the grounds on which the distinction inculcated by Mr. Faber is founded, it is manifest, and is indeed freely acknowledged, that in certain cases, individualism gradually becomes equivalent to nationalism, though it may be doubted whether, in point of fact, any such instance has ever yet occurred. In strictness of speech, it is maintained that ecclesiastical individualism can never merge in nationalism until we shall behold a nation, every individual of which has become a member of the Catholic Church, and not a single person remains without its pale, either as an infidel or a heretic. For, since an election into the Church of Christ constitutes the true meaning of scrip-

* The Study of Church History recommended, &c. By Hugh James Rose, B.D.

tural election, it is obvious that neither an infidel nor a heretic can be consistently deemed to have been thus elected; or at least, if in the first instance they were thus elected, they plainly must be viewed as having deliberately *renounced* the privileges of their election. To say those who professedly belong not to the Church are yet members of the Church of the Election, is a palpable contradiction in terms.

This, according to Mr. Faber, is the ideality of election—the gift or benefit comprehended in the vocation wherewith all Christians are called. But what, in the next place, is the moving cause in the Divine Mind, or the reason why some are called and others pretermitted? No other reason can be assigned than the sovereign will of God—the principle on which Jacob was chosen and Esau passed by. St. Clement, desirous to assign a motive for the election of such as should constitute the Church in various ages, refers to the foreknowledge of God, severing the good from the bad, choosing the former and rejecting the latter. But, in opposition to this hypothesis, it is argued that, were the foresight of man's righteousness the ground of election, there would be no wicked person within the pale of the Christian communion. The existence of bad men in the Church would involve a contradiction in terms, were the foreknowledge of virtue and holiness, in all cases, the true ground of their admission to the blessings of the covenant of grace.

The general question being settled, it remains to be determined what are the real doctrines of the Church of England on the important heads of Predestination and Election. With modern Calvinists it is not uncommon, as our author remarks, to claim the Anglican Church as their own, *de jure*, if not *de facto*; and the proof or basis on which they found their claim is the seventeenth article. The most satisfactory reason that can be assigned for the groundlessness of this opinion is the simple fact, that when the Articles were composed, the doctrines of Calvin were hardly known in this country, because the work in which he advocated his peculiar dogmas was published only the year before the Articles appeared. In 1551, Cranmer received a command to prepare a Book of Articles, which, when completed, were, the same year, submitted to the bishops. In May, 1552, they were laid before the privy council; and in the following September they were revised, arranged in a somewhat different order, received titles which had not been previously affixed to them, and were, moreover, considerably augmented. Thus improved, they were finally returned to the privy council in November; and in the early part of the year 1553, they were ratified and published.

Now Calvin's controversy on the subject of Predestination did not commence until the close of the year 1551; and his first treatise on that subject, intituled *De Æterna Dei Prædestinatione*, was not published, even at Geneva, till the month of January, 1552. Hence it is manifest, that the seventeenth article, as originally drawn up and communicated to the bishops in the year 1551, cannot, by any possibility, have been borrowed from Calvin. Nor, for the same reason, can it be said directly to contradict the notions of Calvin on Predestination; but all the torture in the world cannot make it assert his doctrine. The utmost which can be said is, that while the former part holds *some* doctrine, relating to *some* predestination, the latter part is very vehement against *some* notions on the same subject. But bring the proper light to the article, and it does not remain, as no true Christian could ever believe it would, in this discreditable state of mist and darkness. The proper meaning is to be drawn from the works of the schoolmen, to which several of the articles were opposed. Those ingenious speculators held the doctrine—not that God, as Calvin said, foredoomed some from eternity to weal and some to woe, without consideration of their characters—but that he first foresaw what each individual would be, and so foreknew, and then and therefore foredoomed him accordingly. Now it is this doctrine which our article directly, clearly, and strongly opposes. The schoolmen teach the predestination of individuals. The article, on the contrary, teaches the predestination of the whole body of the faithful, and speaks of it as of the highest comfort, as beyond all doubt it is, that God, of his infinite mercy, foredoomed, before the foundations of the world were laid, that all who accept the Gospel Covenant shall be rescued from the curse; shall have all done for them which is necessary for their salvation, by the free mercy of God; and after a life spent in his service here, shall enter into his glory hereafter. Great comfort it is, indeed, as the article teaches, to those who feel that they are, by God's grace, living as becomes Christians,—to know that by his *covenant*, made before the world began, the everlasting glory of such as die in this faith, is sure and certain. Having established this point, the predestination of *all* faithful believers by covenant, the article goes on to warn all men against the evil which must arise from having before their eyes the sentence of predestination as respects themselves, and to show them how certainly such a course must lead either to carelessness in vice or to desperation. It concludes with one of those gentle and calm displays of quiet wisdom which are the glory and blessing of our Church. Knowing how fruitless it is for man to speculate on free-will and predestination, as respects *individuals*, and having

given its warning against the vain attempt, it reminds us that it is our duty and our wisdom (without coming to any decision on what in theory it is impossible, and in practice useless, to know) to take God's promises as they are set forth to us in Scripture, by them to regulate our lives, and to leave our eternal interests in the hands of Him who loves us with a love passing the love of any earthly parent, and desires above all things to bring *all* his children to his home and his bosom.*

But the view now given is greatly confirmed by the circumstance, well established by Mr. Faber, that if Cranmer was in any degree influenced by the advice of the German reformers, it was to Melancthon he paid the respect of asking counsel. It is clear that the archbishop had consulted him on some point connected with the decrees of God; and the conclusions to which he had now arrived are abundantly manifest from the nature of his answer—"A manifold variety of explications have been and still are excogitated, merely because simple and sincere antiquity is neglected. I beg therefore that you would deliberate with good and really learned men, what great need there is of caution and moderation in formally expressing any decision. At the commencement of our Reformation the Stoical Disputations among our people concerning Fate were very horrible; and these debates did much mischief to discipline. Hence I request that you would think well respecting any such formula of doctrine."

When the Reformation began, Melancthon himself had, in common with most others, embraced the repulsive doctrine of Absolute Predestinarian Fatalism; but he appears to have abandoned it so early as the year 1527, and after the diet of Augsburg, in the year 1530, it was no more heard of. At all events, in the year 1529, he had not only given up but even strongly repudiated that doctrine; a fact which is proved by a letter written by him shortly before his death to Stathmio, wherein he states that he had relinquished all such opinions thirty years ago. Accordingly, though he had introduced the tenet into his *Loci Theologici*, he afterwards, in the edition of 1535, wholly expunged it; and from that date expressed his rooted abhorrence of it in the very strongest terms. Suffice it to mention, with regard to the subject in hand, that Melancthon had renounced the dogma of predestinarian fatalism long before he was consulted by the English primate on the doctrine of the seventeenth article. We have seen, too, that while he laments the mischief which had accrued to the Reformation, at its early stage in Germany, from what he calls Stoical Disputations concerning Fate, he strongly

* Rose's Study of Church History.

dissuades the archbishop from introducing any such speculations into those authorized documents of the Anglican Church, which were then about to be prepared; advising him rather, in order to obtain sound information on the subject, to turn towards that simple and sincere antiquity which had been too long and too much neglected. Nor can it be said of him, that while he rejected Manichæan fatalism, he retained those views of predestination and election which were held by Augustine: for, to the great annoyance of Calvin, he rejected with equal abhorrence the doctrines of that divine, as being the very system which he had renounced under the name of Stoical Necessity. He even proceeded so far as to style Calvin himself the Zeno of Geneva; reprobating, in strong terms, the violence he had used towards his opponent Bolsec, whom, for his opposition to the tenet of divine decrees, he had banished from the republic.*

But, as is well known, the seventeenth article has never been satisfactory to the Calvinists of this country, for though it does speak of predestination, it gives no countenance to the notion of a fixed irreversible election of certain individuals to eternal life. Of this defect, as Mr. Faber observes, the Calvinizing party, which, toward the end of the reign of Elizabeth, and the beginning of the reign of her successor, James, had great weight in the Church of England, were perfectly aware, and laboured hard to repair it.

Accordingly in the year 1595, Dr. Whitaker, the very able leader of the Calvinistic party at Cambridge, clearly enough perceiving the deficiency of the seventeenth Article as given in the years 1552 and 1562, drew up, as an explanation of it, those nine subsidiary Articles, which, from the circumstance of their having been composed at the Archiepiscopal Palace, are usually styled the *Lambeth Articles*, and which no doubt most abundantly supplied that deficiency. Of these nine articles the four first were couched in the following terms, which explicitly define both the *idea* and the *cause* to be the very idea and the very cause which are propounded in the Calvinistic system.

1. From eternity God predestinated some to life, and reprobated others to death.
2. Of predestination to life, the moving or efficient *cause* is not a prevision of faith, or of perseverance, or of good works, or of any thing inherent in predestinated persons, but the sole will of the good pleasure of God.
3. The number of the predestinated is predefined and certain; which number can neither be increased nor diminished.

* On this ground, Mr. Faber as well as Mr. Rose follow Archbishop Lawrence.

4. They who are not predestinated to salvation, will necessarily be condemned on account of their sins.

It is well known that these, with the five remaining Articles, were never received by the Church, though various attempts were made to introduce them as an authoritative explanation of the seventeenth. At all events the desire to have them engrafted on the creed of the nation, shows clearly that the Calvinists were not satisfied with the form in which their favourite doctrines were promulgated by Cranmer and his colleagues. Indeed, with respect to the Articles generally they were very little pleased; complaining that they *speak very dangerously of falling from grace*; an error, said they, *which is to be reformed*.

No one who is acquainted with the history of our Articles will claim for them a Calvinistic origin or import; and all who have read Mr. Faber's book must have found reason to be satisfied that the doctrine held by our Church, on predestination and election, coincides perfectly with the belief of primitive times relative to these fundamental tenets. On the same grounds and by a similar process of reasoning it might be shown that the Articles are not Arminian. The seventeenth in particular is, when properly construed, not less opposed to the school of Leyden than to that of Geneva; rejecting, on either hand, the unalterable destination of individuals by a decree of heaven, to the enjoyment of eternal happiness, whether as founded on the foreknowledge of a fruitful faith, or on the absolute pleasure of the Almighty. We are reminded in it, that, though the decrees of predestination be unknown to us, yet must we receive God's promises in such wise as they be generally set forth to us in the Holy Scripture; and in our doings, that will of God is to be followed which we have expressly declared unto us in the word of God.

We are much pleased with the observations of Mr. Faber on the phrase "generally set forth." The import of the *generally* is, he suspects, very often and very widely misapprehended by the readers of the seventeenth Article as it occurs in the English form. The term is thought to be equivalent to *usually*, or for *the most part*; and thence the clause is supposed to teach that in the matter of election, God's promises must be received as they are most *usually* set forth in Scripture, so that in the interpretation of holy writ we must not set up one text in opposition to another text. But this is in no wise either the meaning of the term or the drift of the clause. From its ambiguity, the word *generally* has, no doubt, been infelicitously selected; but a moment's inspection of the Article in its Latin form will show us the true import of the term. Its sense is not *generally* as opposed to *unusually*, but *generally* as opposed to *particularly*: it is *gene-*

raliter, in Latin, not *plerumque*. Had the word *generically* been used in the English form, all ambiguity would have been avoided; and thus the real drift of the clause would have stood out plain and distinct. The latter part of the Article is an explanation of its former part. We must embrace the doctrine of the *predestination to life*; but then as that predestination through the *medium* of election into the Church Catholic, is, so far as respects particulars or individuals, only according to God's moral purpose and intention, the promises of God in regard to predestination and election, must be received *generically* not *specifically*. That is to say, the promises of God must be received *generically*, with a reference to the *whole collective Church of the Election*, which Christ has founded on a rock, and which can never be finally overturned: not received specifically with a reference to a *certain number of individuals of that Church*, whose particular predestination to life might thence be erroneously pronounced absolute and irreversible. In this explanation, furnished by the Article itself, we may plainly, in its very phraseology, detect the assisting hand of Melancthon; and where his hand is detected, we can never doubt the real meaning. In precise correspondence to his language and to its own self-explanation of the use of the word *generically*, the Article, throughout its entire composition, employs a phraseology, not singular or *particular*, but plural or *generic*. It teaches, for instance, *every* member of the Church to speak of the godly consideration of an election; and in the Latin form, though in the English exhibition of the Article the phraseology has been departed from, it farther teaches all the members of the Church to say that this godly consideration doth greatly confirm our faith of eternal salvation to be enjoyed through Christ, and doth vehemently kindle our love towards God. Now, such pluralizing language, thus put into the mouth of *every* member of the Church, would palpably be improper, unless the author of the Article, like his friend and adviser Melancthon, had held and taught that in *his* sense of the word every member of the Church Catholic, or the Church of the Election, is himself one of the elect of God.

Concerning the opinion of Melancthon himself, and the influence which his judgment exercised over the English primate, there is nowhere any doubt. "Et si alia subtiliter de electione disputari fortasse possunt, tamen prodest piis tenere quod *promissio sit universalis*." Whatever subtilty of disputation there may be concerning the doctrine of election, it will profit the pious to hold that the *promise is universal*. Nor ought we, he continues, to judge of the will of God any otherwise than according to his revealed word; and we ought to know that God has commanded

us to believe. We, therefore, in all simplicity interpret the declaration *universally*, God willeth all men to be saved; that is to say, He wills the salvation of all men, so far as his purpose or intention is concerned. “*Nos igitur simpliciter interpretamur hanc sententiam universaliter, Deus vult omnes homines salvos fieri; scilicet, quod ad ipsius voluntatem attinet.*”

The doctrine of Melancthon and of the Church of England, that the scriptural promises of God must be understood generically and not particularly, stood so directly opposed to the tenets of Calvin, that we cannot wonder at his specific resistance to it in set terms. “*Aliquid disserui, eorum errorem refellens, quibus generalitas promissionum videtur æquare totum genus humanum,*” said the angry disputant, alluding, it is probable, to the milder and more orthodox system of the author of the Augsburg Confession.

Our limits will not allow us to follow Mr. Faber through the remainder of the ninth chapter of his second book, in which he illustrates with great success the important position that the other authorized documents of our Church corroborate the interpretation he has given of the seventeenth Article. He shows that the doctrine of election held by the Anglican Establishment, is the choice of certain individuals into the pale of the visible Church, with God’s purpose, will, or intention, that, profiting by their privileges, they should finally be saved: holding, at the same time, the moral possibility of those elect persons so falling away from grace as finally and irrevocably, through their own perverseness, to perish; and that, farther, in strict accordance with God’s promises as they are generically set forth in Scripture, she holds the doctrine of universal as opposed to particular or limited redemption.

It has been urged by Calvinists that every Christian who reflects seriously must, in effect, adopt their sentiments, because, except on the plan of an assured and irreversible election to eternal glory, no person can feel any solid comfort or satisfaction in his own state; because, in short, no person can say whether he attains to the requisite standard of holiness, or whether after all, he may not finally fall away to perdition. But it is well observed in reply that such a statement as this can never, in the very nature of things, be made to bear on the simple question of the truth or falsehood of a doctrine. In other words, no inward feeling of the *comfort* of being irreversibly elected to eternal happiness can by any conceivable possibility establish the actual existence of such a plan of Election. Those pious individuals who employ such language unconsciously confound together two points which in themselves are essentially different and distinct: namely, the abstract *truth* of the Calvinistic doctrine of election, and the as-

sumed *certainty* that he who maintains the truth of that doctrine is himself one of the elect. On the ground that these two points coincide, is founded the notion, that the Calvinistic tenets as to Predestination and Election must be the source of satisfaction to every true believer. But this assumption, it is obvious, rests on a mere fallacy; for even on the supposition that the doctrine of Calvinistic Election is scripturally true, it by no means follows that every person who receives it is therefore one of the elect. Yet it is quite clear that any comfort accruing to the individual *must* arise, not from his abstractedly holding the doctrine in question, but from his absolute certainty of his particular election to eternal life. How, then, is this absolute certainty to be attained? Can it be said that a mere belief in the abstract truth of the doctrine conveys the certainty of the believer's *own* irreversible election to eternal glory? This will not, we presume, be anywhere maintained.

Again, then, it may be asked, how is a disciple of the Genevan school to know assuredly that he is one of the elect? It will be replied, perhaps, that he knows this fact from the conformity of his heart and conduct with the requisitions of God's holy word. But, as Mr. Faber sensibly remarks, if we be finally brought to *such* an answer, it is difficult to comprehend what *greater* comfort can be held out by Calvinism than by Anti-calvinism. For a Calvinist may be just as much racked with doubt, whether from his heart, his life and conversation, he has sufficient evidence that he himself is one of the elect, as an Anti-calvinist may be as to the sufficiency of similar evidence that he is indeed a child of God. In short Calvinism can afford no peculiar comfort to any individual, unless he be assured that he is himself infallibly elected to eternal salvation; and that such an assurance must flow, not from a bare speculative belief in a particular scheme of theology, but from a conscious conformity of the heart and life with the revealed word of God; the Spirit itself, from such conformity, bearing witness with his spirit that he is a child of God. "If *without* that conformity, a man deem himself one of the elect *merely* because he has an internal *feeling* that this is the case, such an individual may well be a subject of our hearty intercessory *prayer*, but he has placed himself out of the pale of any *reasoning* founded upon Scripture."—p. 200.

In the course of this learned work the author has successfully established the following positions; namely, that the primitive doctrine of Election was neither Calvinistic nor Arminian, but the choice of certain individuals to the privileges and hopes of the Gospel; and also that the views entertained on this important tenet by our Church strictly coincide with the opinions held

during the early and purest ages of the faith. He has proved, by a careful examination of historical records and professional treatises, that, prior to the days of Augustine, there was no stumbling-block in the way of the plain Christian, as to the rule of life or the ground of hope after death; and that no one had as yet ventured to teach any other species of Predestination than such as was inculcated by St. Paul and received by the Apostolic Fathers. He has shown that, in primitive times, every professing member of the visible Church of Christ was one of the elect in the original and proper sense of the term; a truth which he illustrates beautifully by a reference to our Liturgy, both in the daily service and occasional offices. We pray that the infant newly baptized may remain in the number of God's faithful and *elect* children: and we also pray to our holy and most merciful Saviour, that most worthy Judge Eternal, to suffer us not at our last hour, for any pains of death, *to fall from him*. The indefectible purpose, the irreversible decree, the seal of heaven fixing from all eternity the weal or woe of every human being, were unknown to Clement, Ignatius, Justin and Irenæus, and indeed to all the writers of the three first centuries.

It may not be unsuitable to notice that Augustine was almost entirely ignorant of the Greek language, without a competent knowledge of which no one can be held qualified to expound the Scriptures. Gibbon remarks that the superficial learning of the Bishop of Hippo was confined to the Latin tongue; that he disliked and neglected the study of Greek; that he boldly sounded the dark abyss of grace, predestination, free will, and original sin; but that his "orthodoxy was derived from the Manichæan school." These circumstances would of themselves diminish our confidence in the deductions of Augustine, even though he did not stand alone among the Christian commentators of antiquity.

We leave Mr. Faber's book, and pass on to the other mentioned at the head of this article, which professes to treat of the same subject, though, it will soon appear, in a manner as different as possible. The former appeals to Church History as the ground of its decisions; the latter invites its reader to consult his own feelings, to weigh the matter *in foro conscientiæ*, to listen to the judgment of the inner man, to ponder the dictates of the heart, assuring him, if he does so, that he will no longer repose his belief in Calvinistic Election.

Mr. Erskine has long enjoyed a high reputation in a certain section of the theological world as a zealous advocate of those opinions which distinguish the followers of the late Mr. Irvine. His several treatises, some of which have been noticed in this journal, indicate a strong and settled belief in the miracles

said to have been performed in the North, and even in the supernatural gift of tongues. But a more dispassionate study of the principles and facts to which he formerly yielded his conviction, has satisfied him that he was deceived; and accordingly, with that candour and love of truth which seem to pervade all the feelings of his heart, he now acknowledges that he had allowed himself to be misled, or, at all events, to adopt conclusions which his maturer thoughts refuse to sanction.

“In two former publications of mine, the one entitled a ‘Tract on the Gifts of the Spirit,’ the other, ‘The Brazen Serpent,’ I have expressed my conviction that the remarkable manifestations which I witnessed in certain individuals in the West of Scotland, about eight years ago, were the miraculous gifts of the Spirit, of the same character as those of which we read in the New Testament. Since then, however, I have come to think differently, and I do not now believe that they were so. But I still continue to think that to any one whose expectations are formed by and founded on the declarations of the New Testament, the disappearance of those gifts from the Church must be a greater difficulty than their re-appearance could possibly be. I think it but just to add that though I no longer believe that those manifestations were the gifts of the Spirit, my doubts as to their nature have not at all arisen from any discovery, or even suspicion, of imposture in the individuals in whom they have appeared. On the contrary, I can bear testimony that I have not often in the course of my life, met with men more marked by native simplicity and truth of character, as well as by godliness, than James and George M'Donald, the two first in whom I witnessed those manifestations. Both these men are now dead, and they continued, I know, to their dying hour, in the confident belief that the work in them was of the Holy Ghost. I mention this for the information of the reader who may feel interested in their history, although it is a fact which does not influence my own conviction on the subject. To some it may appear as if I were assuming an importance to myself by publishing my change of opinion, but I am in truth only clearing my conscience, which requires me thus publicly to withdraw a testimony which I had publicly given, when I no longer believe it myself.”

Leaving the author to settle this case with his former friends, the believers in Mr. Irvine, we proceed to examine the grounds on which he has established his new faith as to the doctrine of Election. The result at which he arrives differs not essentially from that so ably recommended to our acceptance by Mr. Faber, though the medium whereby he has attained his end is, as we have already observed, totally unlike. He does not conceal that, for many years, he professed to hold the Calvinistic doctrine, modified, as he acknowledges, “very inconsistently,” by the belief of God’s love to all and of Christ having died for all; and yet when he looks back on the state of his mind, he now feels it would be

truer to say that he submitted to it rather than believed it. He submitted to it because he did not see how the language of the ninth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans could bear any other interpretation: though all the while he could not help feeling that, on account of a few difficult passages, he was giving up the plain and obvious meaning of all the rest of the Bible, which, in the most unequivocal language and in every page, seems to say to every man, "See I have set before thee, this day, life and good, death and evil, therefore choose life that thou mayest live." He could not help feeling that if the Calvinistic hypothesis were well founded, then *that* on which a real and righteous responsibility in man can alone be founded, is wanting; and that the slothful servant had reason when, in vindication of his unprofitableness, he said, "I knew thee that thou art a hard man, reaping where thou hast not sown, and gathering where thou hast not strawed." Above all, he could not help feeling that if God were such as the Calvinistic doctrine describes him, then the Creator of every man is not the friend of every man; and that when Christ was preached to sinners, the whole truth of God was not preached to them, for that there was something behind in the mind of God, giving the blessing to one and withholding it from another, so that the ministry of reconciliation was only an appendix to a deeper and more dominant ministry, in which the Almighty appeared simply as a sovereign without any moral attribute, and man was dealt with as a mere creature of necessity without any real responsibility. He relates that he was wont to rebuke the doubt of his heart by appealing to the words of Scripture, and especially by the consideration that the finite understanding of man was incapable of comprehending the infinite mind of God. But still he remained unsatisfied, because he met with passages in the Bible in which God invites and calls upon men to judge of the equality and righteousness of his ways, placing himself, as it were, at the bar of their consciences, and claiming from them a judgment testifying to his righteousness and clearing him of all inequality, and that, not on the ground that his righteousness is above their understanding, far less on the ground that he has a sovereign right to do as he pleases, but on the ground that his righteousness is such as men can judge of, and because it is clear and plain to that principle of judgment within them by which they approve or condemn their own actings and the actings of their fellow men.

Had Mr. Erskine, in this state of mind, been qualified, like Mr. Faber, to ascend to the high fountains of Christian antiquity, and to draw from them the pure and living water of truth, his anxiety would have vanished and all his difficulties would have been removed. He would have discovered that the irrational and unscrip-

tural system against which the simple feelings of nature had risen in rebellion, was not held by those earliest Fathers of the Church who received their teaching from the Apostles, and that no countenance can be claimed for it from the writings of any author of reputation during the first four hundred years after the era of Redemption. He would have found that Augustine, when he introduced his speculations on Predestination and Election, was charged with neologism; that the great body of the faithful rejected them; and, moreover, that his opinions on those profound inquiries have been ascribed to a species of philosophy which St. Paul described as science falsely so called.

The want of systematic learning betrays Mr. Erskine on many occasions, even where his views cannot be pronounced positively unsound, or in any great degree inconsistent with the analogy of faith. There is, besides, throughout his book a tendency to mysticism which sets at defiance all the ordinary rules of criticism, and laughs to scorn nearly all the received principles of interpretation. His appeals to the rational conscience and the inward light proceed too much on the ground that, in the exposition of Scripture, every man must be law unto himself; whence it might be inferred, by a rash or careless commentator, that the decisions of his own mind must be the ultimate test of truth. There is, moreover, in some places a bold innovation on the established modes of speech and meaning of words. For instance, he affixes to the phrase Natural Religion an import not only quite unjustified by the practice of good writers, but apparently inconsistent with the etymology of the terms. According to him, natural religion does not mean any thing that "man's own intellect imagines" or discovers of God and his relation to men; but only that inward knowledge of God and his purpose toward us that every human being gains or may gain by the striving and teaching of "the Spirit in his conscience." *Natural* religion, he maintains, is synonymous with *true* religion. It is not produced by that exercise of the intellect by which we trace effects to their causes, and thus arrive at a First Cause, which we call God; but it springs from a *real root in our nature*, so that the doctrines of it are believed not merely or chiefly on any outward authority whatever, nor on any process of reasoning whatever, but on the authority of an inward consciousness, in the same way as we believe that there is a God and that justice is right and injustice wrong. By the epithet *natural*, as used in this connection, he does not mean to refer to the source from which the suggestion of a doctrine first comes to us, but to the authority which finally seals it to us; and under this description of natural religion, he comprehends all doc-

trines which, though coming to us by external revelation, meet with or awaken the inward consciousness, and are thus known by us to be true on the authority of that consciousness. He opposes natural religion, not to revealed religion, but to what he calls "conventional religion"—that is, religion adopted on external authority, without any living consciousness within our hearts corresponding to it.

"Whilst a man is not feeling the voice in his conscience to be the voice of a Great Being who in this way comes near to him and desires to make Himself known to him, but is considering it and treating it as a part of himself, like his feelings of benevolence, or compassion, or regard for self-preservation, he may be acknowledging the truths of theological science, or of the Bible, and he may be ordering his conduct according to the received maxims of the age or country in which he happens to live: but he has not a religion which has a living root in his heart, he has a conventional and not a natural religion. He does not yet know God at first hand. The God of theology is a power or a principle, discerned by the intelligence through a logical process; the God of the conscience is a personal being, possessing a personal character, discerned by the conscience as light is by the eye. Those whose knowledge of God comes through theology often dispute as the Epicureans and others, whether there be such a thing as special providence, and whether it cares about the condition of individual men, and seeks the direction of their character and conduct; whereas those who know God through their consciences, begin with those very points as the grounds and elements of their religion, and as matters not of inference but of consciousness. But some one may here interrupt me and say, 'I have no consciousness of this within me, as you are pleased to call it, being any thing else than a part of my own nature, and especially I am not conscious of its proceeding from a Being distinct and separate from myself; and surely you have no right to make your own consciousness, or your imagined consciousness, a general standard of human consciousness, or as indicating a general fact with regard to the condition of men.' I answer that there are many things even in our physical constitution which whilst unattended to are not matters of consciousness, but which become so by being attended to. Thus the action of the stomach and of the heart, whilst we are occupied about other things, is not matter of consciousness to us in general. But if we read a book on the subject of these organs, and thus have our attention drawn to them, we gradually grow into a consciousness of their action. But this could not be, unless there were actually within us a dormant consciousness of this action prior to any such attention. Attention could not create that consciousness, it only awakens it."

This specimen may suffice to give the reader a notion of the ingenuity and perverseness of Mr. Erskine's reasoning. But when he restricts himself to the proper subject of election, he throws away his mysticism and argues with all the clearness and

vigour of a true philosopher. For example, his remarks on Edwards's theory of free will are at once judicious and conclusive, striking at the root of the absurd doctrine which the American divine endeavours to engraft on the pure stock of revelation. This author, as every one knows, considers all men, whilst unregenerated, as still standing in that state of helplessness into which Adam's fall brought human nature, and as being no otherwise affected by the redemption of Jesus Christ than as having been placed by it in such circumstances that God may now, consistently with justice, by a special act of grace, apply the benefits of it to such individuals as he chooses; but he sees no gift of spiritual light or life, given to them as a race, in Christ. He thus regards them all as born heirs of a nature possessed exclusively by a corrupt will, and as destitute of any means of resisting it; and of course he concludes that nothing but a new and special power acting upon them from without, can rescue them from that necessity of evil to which they are bound. This is Edwards's hypothesis as to man's condition, and he persuades himself, as he has succeeded in persuading many others, that this condition is consistent with a true liberty and responsibility, by adopting a definition of liberty which makes no reference whatever to the moral condition of man, and which therefore confounds his rational liberty with the unconscious liberty of a beast. We agree with Mr. Erskine in thinking, that Edwards's great success as a theological metaphysician, has arisen from the fact that this definition has been generally passed over uncriticised and unquestioned, and that the true answer to his book would consist in pointing out the incompleteness of the definition on which so much of his reasoning rests.

The definition now mentioned is as follows, "Liberty is the power or advantage that any one has to do or to conduct as he pleases." Now it is evident that this definition makes no reference to the moral condition of man, and in fact applies equally well to the liberty of a beast as to that of a man; for it requires nothing more in the subject than an inclination to act, and the power to act according to that inclination. Edwards avails himself, to the fullest extent, of the advantage which this definition gives him. He tests by it the condition of man such as the highest Calvinist supposes him to be, namely, destitute alike of all inclination and of all means to resist the power of evil; and because he finds that amidst all this destitution, there is still left him the inclination to do evil, and the power to act according to that inclination, he pronounces him as free as it is possible to conceive a creature to be, and of course thoroughly responsible.

By this definition, also, he proves the consistency of absolute unconditional decrees of election and reprobation with liberty and responsibility; because, notwithstanding the darkest of these decrees, the inclination and the power to do evil are still left to the reprobate. As therefore his whole demonstration of the consistency of the Calvinistic view of man's condition with liberty, rests on the accuracy of the definition, it will follow that if the definition be proved inadequate or faulty, the demonstration must fall to the ground. Mr. Erskine undertakes to accomplish this task, and on the ruins of the hypothesis which will be thereby overthrown, he hopes to establish a more reasonable principle; showing that the true notion of human liberty requires conditions utterly incompatible with the common doctrine of Election.

"If I wish," says he, "to remove an animal from one field to another, I have only to remove his food, and the animal follows his own natural impulse, and exercising 'the power to do as he pleases,' goes to the place which I have destined for him. According to Edwards's definition of liberty, this animal is perfectly free; but surely it is not free, with a liberty which we could consider suitable to a moral being. We cannot but see that the definition here proves itself to be too wide, because it lets things pass through it which ought not to pass through it; and that it is deficient in discrimination, because it makes no distinction between the blind liberty of a beast, and the rational liberty of a man; we cannot therefore be justified in placing any dependence upon it. But let us pursue this path a little further. In the same way that I manage this animal, a ruling man of governing talents may manage his fellow men, and without putting any constraint upon them, may make use of their appetites, and passions, and interests, so as to accomplish purposes by them of which they are perfectly ignorant, and in which they have no sympathy with him, but the contrary. They are thus blind, unconscious tools in his hands, and yet in all that they do, they only exercise 'their power or opportunity of doing as they please.' It is evident that neither the animal, nor men who are under such management, can properly be called free, because although they act according to their own purposes, they are unacquainted with the real dominant purpose which is to be fulfilled by their actions, and in subordination to which all their private purposes have been foreseen and arranged. So far, then, the animal and the men thus managed are on an equal footing with respect to liberty, or rather to bondage. But there is this difference between them, that the animal is incapable of any higher freedom than that which it has, whilst the men are. The animal is inca-

pable of entering into my purpose in wishing to remove it from one place to another, and therefore I cannot get it to become a co-operator with me, but am necessarily obliged to address to it a subordinate motive quite separate from my real purpose. Whereas the men are capable of entering into the purpose of their ruler, and if that purpose embraces their interests as well as his own, he may, by disclosing it to them, be delivered from the necessity of employing subordinate means to influence them, and may henceforth have the benefit of their exertions in the capacity of friends and coadjutors, instead of using them as unconscious instruments. If he succeed in this object, they will evidently become free in a sense in which they were not before—they become free in relation to him and to his purpose—for they are no longer used by him for the advancement of his purpose under the semblance and notion of advancing a purpose of their own, and they now act with a conscious view to that object which is the real ultimate object of their acting.”

The idea of liberty, of which we get a glimpse here, is, that it consists in a sympathy, or agreement of choice, with regard to the dominant purpose of our acting, with the ruling and directing mind which appoints our acting; and the capacity of liberty consequently consists in a capacity for such sympathy. We thus arrive at a principle which distinguishes the blind liberty of a beast from the rational and moral liberty of a man; and we cannot allow any definition of human liberty to be just and complete which does not embrace this principle. But in order more distinctly to understand the conditions which are necessary to this sympathy, and of course to moral liberty, let us suppose that the object which the imaginary ruling man has to accomplish through the instrumentality of his fellow men, is a purely selfish object, and directly opposed to the interests of those he is making use of to procure it; is it not evident that, in such circumstances, he never can by any disclosure of his purposes, gain their voluntary co-operation with him, inasmuch as they can never sympathize with him in that which they know to be hurtful to themselves? And hence it is also perfectly evident, that to subjects placed in such circumstances—that is, in a state of subjection to a ruler who has a design contrary to their good—rational liberty is impossible. But when we have once admitted the principle that, in order to be free, we must sympathize with our ruler in the dominant purpose which he has with regard to our actings, we must carry it to the Head of Creation; for it is evident that whilst there remains a ruler or a purpose more dominant than those with which we are acquainted, we are still in bondage. And before we can be truly

and essentially free, as moral and accountable beings, we must embrace the purpose entertained by the Supreme Ruler of the Universe, and be animated with a desire to pursue it, as contributing at once to his glory and our ultimate good. If it be discovered that we have not such minds as are capable of entering into that purpose, then it is also discovered that we are incapable of moral freedom; and that, too, on the same ground as the supposed animal, led by its appetite from field to field, though our deficiency occurs at a higher part of the scale. Or, if it be discovered that the dominant purpose of the ruler is not for our advantage, and does not embrace our happiness, then it is at the same moment discovered that we are in circumstances in which it is impossible we can be free, because it is impossible that we can have sympathy with the ruler or in his purpose. It is obvious that this view of liberty completely does away with Edwards's attempt to prove that the theory of Calvinism is consistent with human liberty; his attempt, namely, to show that man is free, even on the supposition that he is lying under a degree of reprobation, and abandoned by God to the power of the evil spirit. His definition, in short, on which the whole scheme is founded, is a mere abstraction, which makes no reference either to the nature of man, or to his relation with God.

There is another objection to the Calvinistic hypothesis, which must occur even to the least reflecting, namely, that it is *impracticable*, considered either as a rule of life or ground of hope; and this bar to its reception is not in the smallest degree diminished by that modification of its general principles which found favour in the eyes of Baxter, Milner, and others of the same school. The Genevan system is complete and impregnable, if its basis be left unassailed. If the *postulata* be granted, the demonstration cannot be questioned, however inconsistent it may appear with the natural feelings of the human heart, or even with the main tenor of divine revelation. The Christian world is therefore greatly indebted to such writers as Mr. Faber, who show that Calvinism is a corruption of the pure faith once delivered to the Fathers; that it was unknown in the earliest ages of the Church; and that it effected not its entrance within the pale of the Catholic communion without a struggle on the part of the faithful, and an open protest that it was a bold innovation.

ART. III.—1. *The 51st Report of the Society for the Support and Encouragement of Sunday Schools throughout the British Dominions.* 1837.

2. *The 34th Annual Report of the Sunday School Union.* 1837.

3. *The 32d Report of the British and Foreign School Society.* 1837.

4. *The 26th Report of the National Society for promoting the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church throughout England and Wales.* 1837.

5. *The 1st Annual Report of the Home and Colonial Infant School Society.* 1837.

6. *The 1st Publication of the Central Society of Education, 1837—and, Schools for the Industrious Classes, or the Present State of Education among the Working People of England, published under the Superintendence of the Central Society of Education.* 1837.

If diligent exertions and vehemence of declamation will ensure the success of the wishes of any party, we may shortly expect to witness a complete and fundamental change throughout the country in respect of educational affairs. But if solid facts and well grounded arguments are needful for the conviction of the public, and for bringing the sober-minded portion of the community to acquiesce in a mighty disturbance of existing institutions, and an experiment which cannot be divested of tremendous hazard, then, the day may yet be distant when the reformers of schools and schoolmasters shall see the fulfilment of their desires. This assertion is made with reference to grand and fundamental changes, such as are in agitation at the present moment, and not to that gradual improvement and extension of existing institutions, which we should be the first to hail with joy, and promote to the full extent of our powers.

We were ourselves of the number of those who thought not long ago that the signs of the times were indicative of a crisis and consummation in regard to the educational interests of the country most deeply to be deplored. The speeches of ministers, the hints thrown out by their acknowledged organs in the press, and the popular nature of a mighty cry which had been raised, (popular we mean among those who are to be captivated by pleasing and promising sounds,) made us suppose that government would come forward, in its own name, with some grand and comprehensive educational scheme. That henceforth the old machinery, (well as it had done its work considering the difficulty to be encountered,) was to be broken up and sold off, and a new patent apparatus of unheard-of powers to be introduced. And, what inference was more natural, when it was observed that the educa-

tion committees for England and Wales had apparently travelled out of their way both years of their sitting, and tacked on to the evidence, which was obtained in the usual manner, information procured by a different process, and favouring, if not actually announcing, the approaching change. We allude to the supplementary dissertation of Lord Brougham in 1834, sent in after he had seen the evidence of other witnesses, and the meetings of the committee were concluded; and to the evidence of Mr. J. Simpson during *seven* days before the committee on *education in Ireland*, in which the whole system of unsparing change in every department of education is detailed and advocated at great length; and the matter is (we had almost said) *summed up* thus:—(conclusion of 7th day.)

“ And now that the country is under the operation of a new constitution, recognizing the right of the lower classes, in a greater degree than ever, to interfere in their self-government, do not you think that it is a matter no longer of choice, but actually incumbent upon an enlightened and patriotic ministry, as soon as possible, to take up this question of education, with a view to a legislative settlement?—I think that that course is no longer a matter of choice, it is a matter of stern necessity, and points out the only way in which we can expect to reap from the great measure of reform those national and social advantages which it is intended to produce: and we shall find that its working will be irritating, grating and unsatisfactory, till we shall see the day of a much greater diffusion of light, and knowledge, and morality than at present.

“ At present a great portion of the population can read and write; and is it not to be apprehended that many of the evils which are dreaded from the diffusion of education are infinitely more probable from the sort of false or mis-education to which the lower classes of the people are exposed, than if an efficient and ameliorated system of education was put in action by the powers of the government and the people combined?—I have no doubt of it, &c.

“ What then do you conceive to be the duty of the government and the legislature upon this subject?—I think their course is clear; legislation is forthwith required.

“ In Ireland we have already considerable facilities for this purpose, in the establishment of such a board, and in the inclination which is evinced by their last Report of carrying out into effect one of the suggestions you have offered: would you not think that with such facilities before us, it would be a matter of great interest and duty, on the part of the government, to consolidate these advantages as soon as possible by a legislative measure?—I am persuaded that Ireland is in a position to make the great experiment effectually, and that the great *educational battle for England* and Scotland is to be fought there, &c. England and Scotland will see the great plan tried in Ireland, and I expect it will be so well and so effectively tried, that its direct transference to this country, making allowance for certain local peculiarities, will be matter of very easy legislation.”

But, it is one thing for the warrior to gird on his harness and make trial of the buckler and the shield, and another thing to go forth to try his weapons in the mortal struggle of the fight. And after all, though there were other matters besides those which are here referred to in support of the opinion we had adopted previously, we now apprehend that our conclusions were prematurely formed. A different course has been adopted already on the part of government, a course by which they appear to renounce all such hazardous enterprize. They have quietly suffered, or rather encouraged, the old champion to go forth to fight their battle in his own name; and he has manfully girded on his armour for the conflict—and there he is ready, if needful, to cover their own retreat. Moreover, there is not any thing now of that sanguine confidence and devoted ardour within the parliament which has been heard and witnessed without the walls of that house. And even the voice without is comparatively still. We are well aware of the prophetic declamations of men of influence in certain quarters; and are not by any means disposed to disregard or trifle with their words,—they tell us, that “the public mind is every day becoming more and more busied with the bearings of the subject,—that already (1837) a committee on English education has terminated its evidence,—another, on Irish, is about to report;—two others on the Irish education board are occupied at this moment in the House; Lord Brougham has his bill; an address to the crown is to be moved; statistical societies are formed, &c.* And, again, besides these matters, the “principle of the compulsory system is acknowledged in the case of the factory children, and the principle of government interference without regard to religious party in the educational grants of 20,000*l.* a year, &c.”† But we have carefully considered what this specious boasting is worth. And we are sure that there are antagonist statements to be advanced, which possess the solid character of *facts*, and are quite equal to stand their ground against any such assertions as these. In the first place—This whole matter of the education committees, which seem to be arranged like an army against us, (four are enumerated in the foregoing summary,) resolves itself into the Report of one, so far as our argument is concerned, viz. the committee for England and Wales; it sat during two sessions, and terminated its business on each occasion in the following words:—“The committee find themselves unable to report any opinion to the House;—they will therefore content themselves with referring the House

* Thos. Wyse, Esq. M. P. in Second Art. of first Publication of the Central Education Society, p. 63.

† B. Hawes, Esq. M. P. in Tenth Art. of the first Publication of the Central Education Society, p. 281.

to the Evidence, and expressing a hope that the House will, early in the next session, direct a further prosecution of inquiry upon a subject which they deem of the highest national importance." But there was no vigour in the proceedings during the second year, and the suggestion for the re-appointment of the committee was not attended to when Parliament met again ; nor do we hear that there is any disposition to revive its meetings now, but the contrary. A committee, after the lapse of one whole session, has been appointed, not generally for England, but for large towns. As to the bill of Lord Brougham, whether in the session we have just referred to, or in that of the present year, our inferences from the politeness and flattery with which it was received are not very favourable to the success of his lordship's hopes. It is obvious that there can be nothing more convenient for the government than to have such a measure in suspense before the House. It is no trifling accommodation in the discharge of public business to have his lordship's mind so innocently engaged as in reveries of the mighty changes he is about to effect. Considering the relative position and the difference of feeling which exists between the two Houses of Parliament, it is better, without question, that their lordships should discuss the matter among themselves, than that another bill should come up from the lower House only to die *the* natural death. And it must be wonderously agreeable for ministers to be able at any moment to overthrow the whole scheme which is before the House, and to leave the blame of failure not on the ministry, but on one whose back is now inured to the bearing of such a burden. Lord Lansdowne's speech on 1st December, betrayed indications of considerable self-complacency at the position in which he and his colleagues thus stood ; nor did the noble advocate of the measure himself appear altogether unaware of the position in which he himself was placed. He said, and it excited a smile, that, with regard to the former bill, which was the same in principle with that he now brought in, notwithstanding the labour he had taken in forming an abstract and digest, to enable the House to comprehend the subject with the least possible trouble,

" Yet it was not attended to at the beginning of the session, because it was then too early, and it was not attended to at the end of the session, because it was then too late. I cannot say (he added) that your lordships were prevented applying yourselves to the subject at the beginning of the session on account of the press of business, for there was none ; and for some time afterwards your lordships did just as much. At the end of the session there came an event, &c. . . . and no further public business could be transacted."*

As to the principle of compulsory education just referred to as

* The Mirror of Parliament.

the sign of an approaching consummation in these matters, we submit that the case of the factory children is not in point. The drift and design of the act, and the principle it contains, is simply this, that children shall not be overworked; and in proof that such provision is effectually secured, it is enacted that besides the limitation as to hours of employment at the factory, they are to produce a certificate of hours usefully employed elsewhere. That mind must, indeed, be very strangely infatuated, which can pervert such a sober and temperate arrangement to secure the health of children, and prevent the abuse of young apprentices, (many of whom are at a distance from their friends,) into a formal admission by the great council of the nation, of the propriety of a compulsory national education of the young. And how can the annual grant of 20,000*l.* a year be regarded as any proof that government is disposed to incur the requisite expense for a national education carried on by the state? We have, for the five years it has been voted, deduced an inference of the very opposite kind. It has seemed to us like an indirect voucher that help might be looked for to *limited extent*, but that no notion was seriously entertained of adding any item of moment to the Chancellor of the Exchequer's account. And we inferred that government were not disposed (whatever theory, or whatever convictions, they might otherwise entertain,) to disturb the operations of existing societies for education and the voluntary principle which has so long been at work.

In 1834 Dr. N. H. Julius, the conductor of an educational journal and statistical work under the sanction of the ministry in Prussia, was examined before the education committee on England and Wales. We have reason to know that while his general statements stimulated the desires of all members who were looking for the blessings of national centralization and continental schemes, his plain business-like financial exposition, threw a dark and thick cloud over their views. There was no one point on which the opinions of the committee were more completely settled by the evidence they obtained than this, viz. that considerations of expense forbade the entertainment of the grand and comprehensive schemes which should give the whole management of scholastic affairs and interests into the hands of government. But it was not for them to report on such a matter, and thus quash all the pleasing speculations and theories of the day. Dr. Julius explained that the schoolmasters throughout Prussia were generally provided with a house and garden, (which in England is not the case, where such provision consequently would have to be made,) and that the salary of those in country places was little more than 10*l.* a year;—some received only that sum;—the salaries of others varied up to 30*l.* as a maximum;—and that in the

larger towns and in Berlin the maximum salary might be 60*l.* a year. (In England, however, the present scale of salaries is about double of these amounts.) Under such circumstances in Prussia, he said, "the general current annual expense of the whole education (including the universities) amounted to 300,000*l.* and made more than a twenty-fifth part of the whole expenditure of the monarchy."

Mr. Simpson, in his evidence, p. 140, said, "it would require at least as large a grant as the great grant to the West India proprietors to establish a system of national education all over the empire, and perhaps greater;" "yes, (he repeated,) *twenty millions*; as much has often been granted for the fitting out of a fleet, &c." But he was aware that the legislature and the country would be frightened at such a sum, he feared it must be obtained gradually and by successive votes; and, p. 163, the salaries of the board of education, he thought, should be as high as those of the judges, they (the education board) would be quite as important functionaries, and ought to be made so by the government.

Such is the expense which the advocates of a new plan of education honestly avow they shall require to be incurred. And, the various assertions made in the first publication of the Central Society of Education, are fully in accordance with such a scale. Nor are we prepared to say that the calculations are very far wide of the truth, or would exceed the necessities of the case which is supposed. But we do not scruple to hazard a somewhat decided opinion that the Chancellor of the Exchequer has no notion of incurring such responsibilities, nor does any one of the ministry seriously entertain an idea of the kind. On the contrary, the meagre allowance which has been doled out in so noble a cause, and the half offer of assistance in promoting normal schools, which has first been made and then silently withdrawn,* convince us that the government views are altogether of a different kind. Nor do the leading advocates of the measure seriously think that the legislature are in earnest on the subject.

"True it is, they tell us, that some years must elapse before a bill for national education, such as the people of this country *ought to demand*, will pass the House of Lords (where the bill of this session is now happily and safely lodged!) but a bill for education is not at the present moment a *sine quâ non*. Ministers have the power in their own hands, assisted by a simple vote of the House of Commons, of extending indefinitely the number of schools, and of commencing a reform in those which already exist."†

* We allude to an annual grant of 10,000*l.* voted for *Schools in Scotland and model schools in England* at first, but now voted for *schools in Scotland only*.

† Central Society's Publications.

Admitting, as we do, with certain qualifications, the truth of the last paragraph, it is because the ministry possess this power, and have had it all along, and because they avail themselves of it to so very small an extent, that we confidently infer that there is no more intention on their part to carry *the great* educational measure, than there is desire on the part of the country at large that a bill for such a purpose should be passed.

Let those, however, who are in high places, and on whose *fiat* we are supposing the question to turn, let them be permitted only to speak for themselves. While we hear them, be it remembered that *the grand* educational scheme involves, according to some of its warmest advocates, the compulsory attendance of children in schools, as in Prussia; according to others, the entire separation of religious instruction from the every-day business of schools; and according to all, the transferring into the hands of government, or a central board, of which the government must form a part, the whole supervision and control of school affairs.

The debate which recently took place in the House of Lords began with a speech from the Bishop of London on the presentation of a petition against a compulsory education of the people, and the exclusively secular character which the petitioners had heard that some persons were desirous to have enforced with the sanction of the law. His lordship said,

"A feeling appears to have gone forth through the country, that it is the intention of her majesty's government to introduce some measure of this kind. I do not believe this to be the case: I do not think it at all probable, after the course pursued by ministers for some years past. They have adopted the wiser plan of granting a sum of money for the furtherance of education generally, and leaving its application to those societies who are able to meet it with funds of their own: both of which proceed on the principle, that religious instruction should form the basis of all education. This is a much wiser course than it would be to attempt to interfere in a compulsory manner, and to enforce a system which I am well convinced the people of this country would never obey."

This was a challenge calculated to ascertain the mind of ministers, and of any who were interested particularly in the subject. It was immediately met by Lord Brougham in the most unqualified terms. And his lordship's assertions were confirmed by Lord Lansdowne a few nights afterwards.

"Lord Brougham.—I do not believe that either on the part of her majesty's government—on the part of any set of men,—be they in office or out of office—be they corporate or unincorporated,—or, on the part of any individual who has education at heart, and being impressed with a sense of its paramount importance, is also acquainted with the people of this country,—there can exist any intention of promoting legislative measures, either for the purpose of making the education of

the people compulsory on the people, (God forbid ! unless it be intended to make education hateful to them,) or upholding a system of national education which shall exclude religious instruction altogether. I have not heard of any such design in any quarter."—*Mirror of Parliament*, part 441, p. 139.

" Lord Lansdowne.—It is unnecessary for me to say, after the conversation which took place in this house a few evenings ago, that no intention exists, on the part of the government, to force the adoption of a compulsory system of education on the country, or to favour any system from which religious instruction is excluded. Not only is that the fact, not only can I aver that such a project has never entered into the contemplation of government, but I believe I may confidently say, that it never was thought of by any body of men whatsoever."—*Ibid.* part 442, p. 274.

The evening before the Lord President of the council made this declaration, the Secretary of State for the Home Department, upon Mr. Slaney's motion for a select committee to consider the best means of providing useful education for the children of the poorer classes in large towns throughout England and Wales, said,

" I am quite certain that if any plan were adopted in which the religious feelings of this country were not consulted, it would be a decided failure, and an obstacle to the introduction of any plan hereafter. . . . When I give my assent to the motion of my honourable friend, I am impressed with the belief that it will be proper for parliament to take decisive measures for the promotion of education, but that it is a question which no government ought to take up without due consideration, because if they were to introduce any plan which might excite either resentment or repugnance in the people of this country on account of their religious feelings, or that would create additional motives for dissension between the Established Church and the great body of the Dissenters ; they would not be furthering, they would be only obstructing, the great cause which we all have at heart. Therefore when I express an anxious hope that some such plan will be adopted, I wish particularly to guard myself against any pledge to any specific plan."—*Mirr. Parl.*, part 442, p. 254.

If such is the language of men who have matured a comprehensive scheme of their own to bring forward, or who have any specific plans at all in view different from those which are now in operation, we are utterly at a loss to comprehend how their integrity and honesty can remain unaffected. Or, rather, if such language is not a distinct pledge that no new principle of important interference with educational affairs is contemplated, we know not what a public declaration is worth.

The conclusion, therefore, to which we are drawn by the preceding observations and extracts, is just this, that the minds of our senators and of the public at large are still open and ready to hear arguments in favour of *preserving and improving* the existing

state of scholastic affairs. We propose to set forth some such reasons in further confirmation of this conclusion, as are grounded upon facts, and may, we think, tend to open and clear the eyes of certain persons to the real bearings of the question of education, considering the position in which the country now stands. We speak of the opening and clearing of the eyes of the understanding, because we are satisfied that many have been blinded by the dust which has been raised of late about this affair, (whether designedly or intentionally, we will not say). It is however to be avowed freely, and the assertion shall be substantiated by a selection from passages now before us (numbers of which must be omitted from want of space), that some of the popular productions of the day are full of partial statements, and omissions of matter which properly forms a part and parcel of what is adduced, for the purpose of influencing the judgment of readers; which things are by no means creditable to the authors' feelings and taste.

On the whole, it has been thought that in the present state of things, and considering the difficulty which there is in getting access, or in finding time to examine reports, statistical tables, parliamentary documents, &c. &c., we should serve the cause best if we were to put forth, in the first place, a kind of *catalogue raisonné* on the subject of education; and afterwards submit the conclusions which appear naturally to follow from them. Materials exist in abundance for such a task. The history of schools in this country may be traced from its early rise to the fulness (comparatively) of stature which it has now attained. There are documents tolerably succinct, besides those which stand at the head of this article, which enable us to show what is actually doing by different parties throughout the country; what various plans it has been supposed we might adopt with good effect; what would satisfy the feelings of benevolent persons who have hitherto freely devoted their wealth, and time, and strength in promoting schools, and stir up a godly jealousy among them that they should press on even more zealously and effectually than before, in their service of love;—and what, from the avowed practices and principles of such people, must tend to thwart and embarrass and disgust them, and introduce confusion and enmity, where now indeed there is rivalry and competition, but where there is no open breach of harmony and peace.

A document put forth by the National Society in 1832, and circulated by that body as a *single sheet*, will help us a good way in the first part of the task we here propose. It is entitled, "*History of the Rise and Progress of Schools for the Religious Education of the Poor*," and appeared in the Society's 21st Report, for 1832.

Schools are traced from the Reformation of the National

Church to the present time, and some facts are gleaned from documents of an earlier date. The following abstract contains some of the principal heads :—

“ From ‘ The Survey of London ’ by Mr. Stow, it appears that three principal schools belonged to three principal churches in the metropolis in A. D. 1140 ; that there were poor scholars (*pauperes scholares*) connected with every cathedral church, and some other helps. The foundations of Winchester, A. D. 1382 ; Eton, A. D. 1446 ; and St. Paul’s School, A. D. 1508 ; of Christ Church, Newgate, in 1553 ; of Westminster, in 1559 ; Merchant Tailor’s School, 1561 ; and other similar foundations are detailed. It seems that there was a bill in 1539, for ‘ converting religious houses to a better use,’ and a plan on the part of Archbishop Cranmer for ‘ grammar schools in every shire.’ The strictly ecclesiastical arrangements are detailed and shown to have afforded a considerable help in enlightening the people. Some singular schemes of a Mr. Nedham, in 1663, are referred to as expressly designed for the poorest class, which is proved among other things by the quaintness of his appeal to the humane :—‘ Take notice of the rabble we meet in the streets, it must needs pity any Christian heart to see the little dirty infantry which swarms up and down the alleys and lanes, &c.’ The plans (and schools now existing and flourishing) which Archbishops Tillotson and Tenison formed ; ‘ the constellation of noble designs which brightened the prospects of the religious world’ at the beginning of the last century ; the rise of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge and for Propagating the Gospel ; and the public annual assembling of charity schools in the metropolis, are related, with the extraordinary efforts of that age ; the collections by the clergy after week-day lectures ; the plan of paying for education in part ; an improved organization of parish clerks ; the help of offertory money ; the produce of charity boxes in the Church ; the *voluntary* collecting of taxes in certain places that the poundage might go to the cause of schools ; the farming of street lamps, and maintaining of and boarding parish children in other places with the same design, furnish interesting proofs of the spirit of the age. Then, there are three plans specially enumerated, which had each its day. 1. The Wiltshire Village School System ; 2. The plan of the Welsh Circulating Schools ; and 3. The ‘ Petty School’ plan in the Isle of Man, which were “ the foundation of catechising.” After this follows the rise of Sunday-schools, and the gradual ripening and whitening towards the harvest which after-ages were to bring in. In 1796 the well known efforts of ‘ The Society for Bettering the Condition of the Poor’ are related ; and lastly, the source of whatever has followed, the discovery at Madras by Dr. Bell, and the skilful application and development of the system of mutual tuition by that person and Mr. Lancaster,” &c., &c.

In all this history, which is exceedingly interesting, and within the power of any person to procure by asking at the National Society’s Central School, the most remarkable fact, to our apprehension, is this, viz. that the whole is the result of the benevolent and voluntary exertions of individuals. We believe it to be per-

fectly true that, "in the English Statute Book from Queen Elizabeth to the present day no notice occurs of schools and schoolmasters, nor any reference to education in England, except by *restrictions* on schoolmasters: imposing disabilities and incapacities, instead of providing support and encouragement."*

It might be worth while to stop and inquire here, who they are, and by what principles and spirit they are influenced, who would erect their machinery to stop the stream which has thus flowed for ages widening and deepening its bed as it went on, and adapting itself to the increasing wants of the nation at large; a flood which has made and forced out a passage for itself, and adapted its course to the necessities and inequalities of the soil through which it has flowed? It might be worth while to ask those who talk of our present broken cisterns as decayed, and as incapable of holding any water at all, what mighty supplies they have to open, which shall fertilize and gladden the face of the soil with a rapidity or an efficacy exceeding or even equalling that which has marked the history of ages gone by?

But the answer to such inquiries will become more apparent as we bring forward other facts, in connexion with the subject, which press on our attention, and fill up the chasm which occurs at the point where the history (to which we have briefly referred) concludes.

The compilers of the Education Abstract made upon the Returns ordered by Parliament in 1833, saw the value of this history and printed it as an appendix to their Report. They coupled with it also some

"Remarks on the Four Chief Educational Societies in the Metropolis, extracted from their Annual Reports for 1834, and from the Evidence given by the Officers of those Societies before a Committee of the House of Commons in the same year, with a view of explaining the cause and showing the extent of *Duplicate Entries* in the school returns."

This is a valuable summary for the purpose of showing what has been and what is doing in the country for the education of the people. Taken in connexion with the reports, &c. which stand at the head of our article, it would furnish a complete account on the subject. Its importance induces us to offer an abstract of the following kind:

"I. Among the societies, the first, in regard to the date of its origin, is 'The Society for the support and encouragement of Sunday-schools throughout the British dominions,' established in London in 1785. It arose out of the exertions of Mr. R. Raikes of Gloucester, and the Rev. T. Stock, in 1783.

"The committee, 18 in number, consists in equal parts of members of the Church of England and Protestant Dissenters. The assistance

* Poor Reports, vol. iv. Introduction, p. 36.

which it renders to schools is by grants of books ; and all schools which receive its aid are bound to attend some place of worship every Sunday, where practicable, and not to teach writing on the Sabbath-day.

“ II. The society instituted next after this, viz. in 1803, is ‘The Sunday-school Union.’ Its objects are, 1. To encourage Sunday-school teachers to greater exertions ; 2. To improve the methods of tuition ; 3. To enlarge existing and establish new schools ; 4. To supply books, &c. Its scholars are generally connected with some congregation, and attend on the Lord’s Day at its place of worship.

“ The committee consists of 36 members, with all clergymen and dissenting ministers who contribute to the funds. Since June, 1824, they have recommended the country Unions to admit into connexion with them such schools only whose conductors are of orderly character, and who hold the doctrines of the Deity and Atonement of Jesus Christ, the divine influences of the Holy Spirit, and that all Scripture is given by inspiration of God.

“ It is stated that the Sunday-schools of the Union have been doubled in their amount within the last fifteen years.

“ III. The next institution is ‘The British and Foreign School Society,’ formed in 1808. It arose out of the exertions made by Mr. Lancaster, and is designed to promote the education of the working classes of every denomination. Books or papers are published for the use of the schools. The Society upholds the principle of liberty of conscience, and the utter abolition of religious tests in connexion with common day school education. The Society has no connexion with Sunday-schools ; no catechism or creed is introduced, nor is any form of prayer taught or used in the schools. It maintains a model school in the Borough-road, and trains all persons who desire to be qualified as teachers of youth. Schools supplied with teachers at its expense are required to be open to the children of parents of all denominations. Grants of school materials, and small donations, are sometimes voted by the Society to schools. The teachers seldom continue in training at the model school for so much as three months.

“ A committee of 48 subscribers conducts the affairs.

“ The schools of this Society are not brought into union by means of any form or terms ; and (except in the metropolis) no returns have been obtained of the number of children receiving education in them.

“ IV. The fourth Society is ‘The National Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor in the principles of the Established Church throughout England and Wales.’ It was formed in 1811, and adopted the discovery made by the Rev. Dr. Bell, at Madras, in 1797. The committee, comprising the Bishops, are appointed by charter, and 16 other members are elected. The Society maintains a central school in the Sanctuary, Westminster, and provides for the instruction of masters and mistresses, who continue under its care upon an average for five months each. The Society promotes 1. Schools for infants under six or seven years of age ; 2. Sunday and Daily Schools for children from six or seven to about thirteen ; and 3. Sunday-schools, chiefly for those who are engaged in labour during the week, the evening being the only time, except on the Lord’s Day, when they profit by the school. Schools of the first and last men-

tioned class are frequently combined. The progress of National schools has taken place at the following rate, viz.:—In 1813 there were 230 schools, with 40,484 children; in 1820, 1,614 schools, with about 200,000 scholars; in 1830, 2,609 *places*, containing 3,670 schools, with about 346,000 scholars; and 1835, 3,624 *places*, with 5,559 schools, containing 516,181 scholars.

“The Society has collected and expended above 100,000*l.*, and an additional 20,000*l.* through the medium of its district institutions; and has thus produced an outlay of money, raised by benevolent contributions, to the amount of above 500,000*l.* on school-rooms. Schools enter into union with the Society, or with some of its district branches, and engage to adopt the National system of teaching, to attend on divine service on the Lord’s Day, to use the *religious* tracts of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. There are twenty-four District Societies in England and Wales, which are in connexion with this Institution, and make grants of money, and thirty-four Corresponding Societies, which have not funds for that purpose. Under these (in the principal towns of the kingdom) there are forty-two District Central Schools, for the benefit of persons unable to visit London for their instruction in the art of teaching.”

“The Home and Colonial Infant School Society” had not appeared before the public when the preceding abstract was put forth.

“It was formed in 1836, for improving and extending the infant school system, by 1. Qualifying masters and mistresses of schools with appropriate instruction; 2. Visiting and examining schools where required, and 3. Circulating information, preparing books, school materials, &c. The executive committee consists of eight elected members, who act on the principle that education must be based on the knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, and that their Central School is open to receive persons of different religious denominations.”

We are induced to add, that the early labours of this institution, which are characterized by energy and zeal, are of the least offensive kind. It has put forth nothing to derogate from the work which other men have performed; its publications are of a sober and temperate character; in proof of which we may mention that the forms and papers it has in use, appear to be framed generally upon the approved documents which are employed for similar purposes by the National Society. As warm friends of the last-named institution (which has a training infant establishment of its own at Westminster, with a boarding-house for the proper accommodation of teachers) we neither admire nor perceive the necessity of the Home and Colonial Society’s exertions. But, if a competitor must necessarily be in the field, if we may not have the infant population left to be framed and fashioned precisely according to our own hearts’ desire, we rejoice to have such a rival to contend with, and to be provoked to holy jealousy by the unblameable zeal which that Society displays. And we confidently point to its origin and its spreading influence as a

proof, beyond confutation, that the energies of the voluntary principle in regard to education are yet unexhausted; that wherever a void or chasm exists in the moral or religious system of our country, or wherever, as in this instance, it is *supposed* to exist, thither the strength and wealth of the benevolent will be brought to bear, deficiencies will be supplied, evils cured or palliated, and the friends of the poor who have begun a good work for their benefit will persevere in the cause, and make good every reasonable expectation which the public can have entertained.

Such, on the whole, is the machinery which the benevolence of the public has created for improving the intellectual, moral and religious condition of the poor. Its worth and efficiency must of course be determined by the fruits which it has borne. Only, we must premise that the golden harvest which some speculators desire to reap at the present hour must not be the measure of our expectations while surveying the efforts of years gone by. If it is now maintained that many great and glorious results would be immediately produced by newly-formed schools, the assertion can only be substantiated on the grounds of what has been done by those schools which already exist. If the fruits of benevolent exertions were swept away from the face of the country, we should never hear at the present hour of schemes which are held forth as perfectly reasonable and attainable by exertions of a moderate kind. A vastly lower standard would be taken as the ultimatum of the reformers' desires. For who would hesitate to admit that the work of education which has already been accomplished in clearing the ground, in levelling and cleansing the soil, was in every respect of greater importance and greater difficulty than that which remains to be accomplished in the way of mere tillage and cropping and gathering in of fruit? But we are disposed throughout this whole matter to rest our argument on facts, and we gladly recur to authentic documents, instead of propping up our cause with many words.

There are two modes of computation by which the results of the machinery just described must be estimated. We must look for a numerical, and we also look for a moral result from these exertions and expenditure of benevolent funds. Of the former it is comparatively easy to give account;—the latter involves considerations of a more complicated description. We shall, however, address ourselves in succession to each.

Of the five societies for education, one only professes at present to give any numerical results. The first and third never did give any, except by showing, from year to year, what schools actually received assistance out of the funds of the institution, and the summary of *metropolitan* schools which is contained in every Report of the British and Foreign School Society. The

Sunday-School Union did give every year, except the last, a rather vague report of voluntary teachers and scholars instructed by them. But there was obvious exaggeration in the statement, which it is needless to dwell upon, because it has been recently suppressed by the publishers themselves, and instead thereof, they have substituted the Abstract of Education Returns, obtained by order of Parliament in 1833. Upon this last document, and the Returns of the National Society, our calculation must be based, and we are spared much space and trouble in the operation by the 10th appendix of that Society's Report for 1837. The public will there find, in considerable detail, an account of the inquiries made by the Society in 1826, 1831, and 1833;—with an abstract of similar results obtained by order of Parliament in 1818 and 1833;—they will find, also, copies of the questions circulated on each occasion, with the principal remarks which those who conducted the calculations, and examined the returns, thought it necessary to put on record by way of explanation. We will compare the Society's inquiries in 1831 and 1837 with each other; and the parliamentary inquiries in 1818 and 1833 with each other, and state our conclusions derived from this process, and from a comparative view of the deductions made by each party.

The SUMMARY of the National Society's inquiries stands thus : early in 1837 there were 12,391 places in England and Wales, containing 16,924 schools, with 996,460 scholars ; the INCREASE since 1831, during *six* years, being 3,610 schools, and 96,048 scholars.

The result here given comprises a calculation for defective returns. The schools are *Sunday* (with or without any evening or other instruction); *Sunday and daily* (meaning instruction on five days of the week), and infant schools (being only week-day schools). They are all professedly religious institutions for the benefit of the poorer classes, more or less under the direction of the clergy, and, excepting the infant schools, generally attending public worship at the parish churches. The detailed account distinguishes the schools (16,924) and the scholars (96,048) thus: Sunday-schools 6,068, with scholars 438,280;—Sunday and daily schools 10,152, with scholars 514,450;—Infant schools 704, with scholars 49,392, from which last number 5,662 are deducted, the same children being also comprised in the Sunday-school returns. The Summary does not comprise the new union workhouse-schools, nor the schools which are in the course of being established by aid of the parliamentary grants. All dames' schools are also excluded, and all private scholars who make high payments for their education, are deducted from the total of the schools to which they belong.

The SUMMARY of the parliamentary inquiry in 1833 is as follows: Sunday-schools 16,828, with scholars 1,548,890;—daily schools 35,986, with scholars 1,187,942;—and infant schools 2985, with scholars 89,005;—the INCREASE of schools, since 1818, during *fifteen* years, being Sunday-schools 11,285, with scholars 1,123,397, and infant and daily schools 19,645, with scholars 671,243.

In this Summary, infant and daily schools are not accurately discriminated. Colleges, except the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, grammar, boarding, proprietary schools, and all preparatory institutions, are comprised in the daily schools; and dames' schools of every description are given as infant schools. Hence 2350 infant schools, which are supported entirely by payments from the scholars, contain only, on an average, seventeen children in each; and 26,791 daily schools, which are similarly supported, contain only twenty-five children in each. There are no means of showing how many of the daily scholars are comprised in the Sunday-schools, and occasion a duplicate entry of the same children, or, by calculation, what the total number of children receiving education may be. And it is to be observed, with regard to the *increase* of schools, that the questions in 1818 and 1833, and the objects with which they were proposed, were so widely different, that considerable doubt is thrown over the result under this head, which appears to be attained with accuracy.

What then, after all, is the number of children of the working classes who are under instruction? It is a question which, we submit, cannot be fully answered at present. The Church can answer it, as we have shown, distinctly as regards itself. But, there are many under instruction besides those in Church schools. The only approximation we could make towards the desired conclusion must be by taking the gross number of scholars, Sunday, daily, and infant, returned in 1833, (*viz.* 2,825,837,) and deducting from that amount the Church of England Sunday and daily scholars, who have doubtless occasioned a duplicate entry to be made. But then, the remainder (thus obtained) would comprise a vast number of petty dames' schools, which are quite undeserving of the name of schools, and a vast number of private academies, with King's College, and University College, &c. which it never could have been intended to comprise in the result.

But if we cannot make an exact approximation to the number who are receiving education; can we determine the number who ought properly to be upon the school-rolls, and enlisted under the head of infant, daily, or Sunday scholars, *i. e.*, can we ascertain the number of children, belonging to the working classes, who ought to profit by public instruction offered at a cheap rate,

and who would do so, we assume, if the schools were such as satisfied the parents, and produced a visible and beneficial result? We may not be able to attain to the exact solution of this inquiry, but by a comparison of the different population returns, an approximation may be made to it, and a result obtained of value and interest. Such a result we have not seen deduced, or attempted to be deduced, before.

Our calculations on the subject run thus:—

The population of England and Wales, in 1831, was 13,897,187;—at the present time, allowing the rate of increase to be (what it is ascertained to be) $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. per annum, the population is now 15,195,782. In the returns for 1831, the ages of the people are not classified as they are in those for 1821. By these latter returns it appeared that there were,

(A)	1,566,268	children	under	5	years	of	age
(B)	1,376,315	.	.	between	5	.	and 10
(C)	1,172,979	.	.	.	10	.	15
(D)	1,045,155	.	.	.	15	.	20

If the population be supposed as at present, of 15,195,782, these last four amounts will respectively be (A) 2,279,120,—(B) 1,904,572,—(C) 1,701,185, and (D) 1,508,161.

Now, on the supposition that the children are equally diffused over the several years which are comprised within each period of five, if we add three-fifths of the first amount (A) to two-fifths of the second amount (B), we shall obtain 2,165,300, or about one-seventh of the population, as the number of children between two years and seven years who are qualified by age to attend infant schools. So, if we add three-fifths of the second amount (B) to two-fifths of the third amount (C), we shall obtain 1,877,218, or about one-eighth of the population, as the number of children between seven and twelve years of age who are similarly qualified for Sunday and daily schools;—and, by adding three-fifths of the third amount (C) to one-fifth of the fourth amount (D), we obtain 1,322,343, or about one-eleventh, as the number of young persons between twelve and sixteen whose age might cause them to be employed in useful services, but might still render it proper that they should attend Sunday-schools, and gain some instruction on other days or in the evening through the week. Hence the total number of children between two and sixteen years of age appears to be 5,364,861, or somewhat more than one-third of the whole population. But many of these children are not of a class or station in society to profit by public means of cheap education. Can any approximation be made to show how many are thus circumstanced?—and how many ought to attend schools?

The population returns for 1831 show that there are 834,543 *families* in the kingdom chiefly employed in agriculture;—1,227,614 *families* chiefly employed in trade, manufactures, and handicraft; and 849,717 *families* of capitalists, professional and other educated men, and labourers NOT employed in agriculture. If we multiply each of these amounts by five, the product will show about (rather more than) the number of persons (men, women, and children) *maintained* under the three divisions which have been recited;—the products will be respectively 4,562,625, —6,712,345; and 4,645,585. The sum of these three products is, of course, somewhat (730,773) more than the total population, 15,195,783. If, therefore, as a rough approximation, we reduce each of these three products to the same extent, (*viz.* by one-third of the excess, 730,773,) we shall have this result:—

(E) Persons <i>maintained</i> by agriculture	4,321,034
(F) Persons chiefly maintained by trade, manufactures, and handicraft	6,470,754
(G) Persons maintained as capitalists, from professional resources, &c., or by <i>labour not agricultural</i>	4,403,994
<hr/>	
Total of population, in 1838, in England & Wales	15,195,782
<hr/>	

Almost all* the first class (E) require the assistance of cheap public schools;—but the superior mechanics and handicraftsmen in the second class (F) do *not* require it;—on the other hand, in the third class (G), the labourers not agricultural (they are chiefly persons employed in mines, fisheries, railways, canals, and public works,) do require it. Supposing, then, that there is a compensation of errors between the class F and the class G (as many not requiring the means of education referred to in F as do require them in G), we may take the sum of the first and second classes, E and F, 10,791,788, to represent the population for whom cheap public means of education are required. And, according to the proportions already ascertained—

$\frac{1}{4}$ of this population is the amount between 2 & 7 years of age	==	1,541,684
$\frac{1}{8}$ ————— between 7 & 12	==	1,348,973
$\frac{1}{11}$ ————— between 12 & 16	==	98,171
		<hr/>

Total number of children between 2 & 16 requiring the means of cheap public education . . }	3,871,758
	<hr/>

* Persons who employ labourers are included in this class.

If this result may be at all relied on, (we are not aware in what point it fails, and it is in every one's power to verify its truth,) it is obvious that there is still a lamentable want of schools throughout the country. However, in estimating the extent of this want, the fluctuation of the children in schools must be constantly borne in mind. And we apprehend, that if due attention be paid to this and some similar circumstances, the results obtained will prove that the parents do not appreciate the means of proper education for their children; and, consequently, in the present state of the adult population, we may actually have as many schools as are required: or, to state the case more properly, we must raise the character of the parents, or else have recourse to some compulsory measures (which it is not our object to advocate), in order to secure a better use of the schools which exist. But the reflections connected with this point would lead us astray from the course we proposed to follow.*

Having disposed, though not quite satisfactorily, of the numerical bearings of the question respecting schools that exist, and the extent to which the wishes of benevolent persons have been carried out, we proceed to an estimate of a different kind. What is the moral, intellectual, and religious result produced by those

* It is startling to read that there are nearly four million children between 2 and 16 years of age requiring cheap instruction, while there are little more than one million of them in Church schools, and in all other schools together (comprising Church schools), less than two million and a half. To account for such a state of things, it must be remembered that, 1st, the general returns in 1833 were far from complete (see *British Critic*, July 1835, pp. 179, 180); and, 2dly, that the fluctuation of pupils in all the schools is immense.

In treating of the comparative value of endowed and unendowed schools (same Article, pp. 204, 205), we gave some striking proofs of this fluctuation of scholars, from statements made before parliamentary committees. On looking to the Report of the National Society for 1832, p. 96, we see that 30 metropolitan schools, taken at hazard from out of the general returns, contained 10,767, and the admissions into the schools during each of the two preceding years had been 7,373, exclusive of re-admissions of children who had been in and out of the schools before; and, in 1834, Report, page 58, 30 schools were taken, which contained 9,715 children, the admissions into which, during the year, were 5,276. The Central Society, in a note to its First Publication, states, p. 172, that "although the British and Foreign Model School contains 600 children, there were no less than 697 fresh admittances in the course of 1836." This shows, that in that institution the case is far worse than in the national schools, and that in none of the schools do the children on an average remain for two years. In the inferior, dame, and private schools, the succession is very much greater, and the opportunity of improving the children, supposing the power of doing so to exist, is proportionably less. With such a rapid passing of children through the teachers' hands, it is obvious that the whole four million children *may have been* more or less connected with the schools from time to time, and thus they may all be under education, as their parents vainly imagine. Our inference is this, that churches and preachers are wanted for adults quite as much as rooms and masters for the young. Unless we mean to introduce compulsory laws, the parents must be taught as well as the children; otherwise, in our zeal for education, we shall cover the country with school-rooms and school-masters and mistresses, but the children will not be sent, or, what is as bad, will not remain at school.

which exist? How do the schools work? Perhaps there are, altogether, about a million and a half, or rather more, of the children of the working classes under education in schools of a public nature, where instruction is afforded at a very cheap rate, where rules and discipline are enforced, and where some superior mind presides, or, at least, generally directs the operations of the schoolmaster or mistress; what fruits are to be seen of the exertions and care of this kind? There are two opinions to be stated, one of which, especially, has of late years been pretty loudly and plainly expressed. But, notwithstanding, the advocates for the voluntary principle, and of the benevolent exertions which have been made, are not dissatisfied with the produce of their labours, and they are ready to carry them on with cheerfulness, and at a considerable expenditure of their private resources.

But the public, who have not hitherto been actively concerned in the work, are divided into two opposite classes, both of which unite, indeed, in the praises of the religious portion of society for what has been done and what there is still a disposition to do;—of these two classes, however, one proclaims its entire dissatisfaction at the result, considered abstractedly, and calls for a complete and fundamental change in the schools; the other, does not see the extraordinary defects and faults which are referred to, although it would gladly improve the institutions and profit by every facility for doing so.

We fearlessly quote the opinions of the former class, being satisfied, that if they are true, they cannot be too widely known, and if they are false, or exaggerated, they need only be submitted to the light, in order that their real character may be exposed. The following are specimens of what we refer to:—

“The age of adolescence, in all instances, is the most dangerous in life: it requires a peculiar treatment, and deserves an attention, which in this country *has never yet been bestowed* upon it.*

“Nor is their religious training much better managed than in elementary schools. The ‘alphabet learning’ of the sacred writ, the superstitious preference of letter to spirit, continues to prevail.†

“England forms the one great exception to the entire civilized world (in the total want of a national organization). The result is not of such a nature as to make us much in love with the cause. It could easily be shown, that the voluntary system of public instruction, with no central power to guide, aid, and control, has not only not worked well, but worked nearly as ill as any system well could. Every sort of antic has been played; all sorts of empirism been permitted; immense waste of time, money, and labour,—often, too, with the most admirable zeal and the best intentions,—with the most miserable, if not injurious, results.‡

* Central Society of Education, First Publication, p. 11.

† Ibid. p. 61.

‡ Ibid. p. 62.

"The schools, where there are any to which they (the working population) can send their children, are for the most part of a character which not only forbids hope of good, but even creates apprehension of evil.* The amount of education is not only lamentably deficient, but, in its kind, not comprising those essentials which are most necessary."†

And in the Second Publication by the same Society from which these words are quoted, we read what follows:—

"Some of these schools are positive nuisances, which, if they cannot be reformed, ought to be put down.‡

"We may now form a tolerably correct opinion of what is doing and what remains to be done for the education of the people. . . . The truth is, England will soon be, if it be not already, the worst educated country in Europe. Even in countries deemed uncivilized, more is done for the education of the poorer classes than in our own. . . . Nothing but inordinate vanity and self-love have blinded us to the truth, that a large proportion of our population are, morally and physically, in a far inferior state to that of the American Indian, whom we term savage."§

We copy the following from a contemporary magazine, the professed guardian of education.||

"We are by no means certain that education has not rather retrograded than advanced, during the intermediate period. There does not exist a school where the principles and practice of true education are developed; there does not exist a book in which lessons are to be found and exercises enjoined, calculated to develop the physical, intellectual, and moral, powers. There does not exist a system that bears a remote approach to what England, the first country in the world, ought to demand for her sons.

"The masters of our National, British and Foreign, and Infant Schools, are, with but few exceptions, composed of handicraftsmen out of employment, gentlemen's servants, or broken-down petty tradesmen; who often come to the central establishments, and what they call by courtesy Normal Schools, ignorant, in many instances, of the common rules of arithmetic, and so miserably instructed in other matters, and at an age so advanced, as to leave little hope of their ever being improved in character, capability, or fitness, for the important work.' "

And the Secretary of the British and Foreign School Society does not scruple to state, not only

"That the existing provision for popular instruction is deficient in quantity, and, in too many cases, still more defective in quality" but "shut out from every thing that can sustain or ennoble an

* Central Society of Education, First Publication, p. 210.

† Ibid. p. 215.

‡ Schools for the Industrious Classes, p. 34.

§ pp. 63, 64.

|| Educational Magazine, No. I. pp. 1, 2.

intelligent nature, the peasantry of England have long since displayed, in unparalleled degradation, the full effects of knowledge denied, and have now sunk into a state of mental inanition and semi-barbarism, from which, it is to be feared, the present generation can never be recovered.*

Nothing can be less equivocal than condemnation such as this. Is it true, or is it false,—or, is it an exaggerated statement only?—Is it put forth out of pure zeal for the improvement of the people, or is it in any way designed for purposes which are not openly avowed?—Indeed, there is very little secrecy observed.—The context, in too many instances, proves that the remarks are especially directed against the Church of England schools. We shall show, by and bye, that the principal among them, those from the publications of the Central Society of Education, have this especial aim. And, if there were none to lift up their voices on the other side, if there were no counter-statements to produce, we might indeed look with confidence for an early annihilation of all our existing schools, and the introducing of others in their places on quite a different plan. But, happily, there are facts and evidences to be adduced in direct opposition to the miserable portraiture which has been exhibited of our schools. There have been abundant testimonies borne to the efficacy and usefulness of the present means of education, both by the clergy in general, and the National Society in particular. There is an Appendix † in the Reports of this last-named institution, which, year after year, has contained a series of facts of the most gratifying kind from the District and Corresponding Societies, scattered, as they are, over every part of the kingdom;—there is another appendix, ‡ on keeping up connexion with old pupils, formerly brought up in the schools, which is full of authentic statements, bearing expressly on the matter at issue;—and, still more opposite is the result of an inquiry, given in much detail, into the character and condition of young persons brought up in national schools. And

“ We believe we may (like a writer of the present day) with perfect truth assert that the National Society is labouring at both points; labouring to increase the number of schools throughout the land: labouring also to enlarge the instruction given therein, that, without losing one jot of its Christian character, it may include many departments of popular knowledge.”—*Metrill's Sermon on Religious Education*, p. 35. 1838.

If the other voluntary associations have anything of the same

* National Education, the Question of Questions, by Henry Dunn, pp. 5, 6.

† Report of the National Society for 1837, App. vii., and in every preceding Report.

‡ Ibid. for 1831, App. ix. reprinted with enlargement, 1837, App. ix.

kind to adduce, and we doubt not that many of them have, we are thoroughly satisfied with the present result of past exertions; though we should heartily desire to see a continued course of improvement, and doubt not, that the exertions which have produced so much already, will succeed hereafter in a far more gratifying degree.

But it is not merely that these societies speak well of themselves; there are disinterested witnesses who have spoken out on their behalf, in a manner which ought, we think, to have considerable weight. Other societies, no doubt, could point to similar testimony on their own behalf, but we, as being chiefly interested for the national schools of the Church, and because that class of schools is far more extensively spread over the country than any other, are content to recite the following recent testimony in favour of these institutions, which was elicited by the discussion on education in the House of Lords, already referred to at the commencement of this article.

The Bishop of London said:—

.....“ I beg to say, however, that in schools connected with the Established Church, or under the superintendence of the National Society, whatever imperfections may belong to them, there is not one to which the term ‘pretended schools’ may be applied. I know, indeed, that there are schools to which that expression, in its most odious sense, might be appropriated, but they are not in connection with the Established Church. The National Society has made great exertions to improve the schools connected with it, and to extend education; I mean education in the largest sense—not merely scriptural but general education—comprehending instruction in various branches of useful knowledge, and, in some instances, in the elements of science.”—*Mirror of Parliament*, Part 442, p. 276.

Marquess of Lansdowne:—

“I am surprised that what I said should have been taken to allude to national schools, for to them my remarks bore no reference. I meant to inflict no sort of stigma upon those useful establishments, where the discipline of education is so excellently propounded. I referred to one class of schools, with respect to which the mischievous idea is inculcated, that there is a provision for the education of the children that does not exist. It was to these, and not to national schools, that I alluded.”—*Ibid.* p. 277.

Lord Brougham:—

“I do not think this is the general state of the schools, very far from it. Many of them afford a very admirable example. I admit that the national schools may justly lay claim to the title of schools, and that the system pursued there may, without flattery, be deemed a system of teaching; but, I will say, that a very large number,—nay, I firmly believe

that the much greater part of the 40,000 charity schools, afford to the youth of England an education which is exceedingly imperfect indeed." —*Ibid.* p. 282.

Is it thought that these are general expressions of courtesy introduced for the purposes of conciliation in the midst of opposition and debate? The suspicion would be worth considering, if they all came from *one side* of the House! But the interests which the speakers may be supposed to represent are quite different. Or, is it said that the observations refer to discipline and moral culture merely, not to the enlargement of the mind and understanding, and the improvement of the intellect? The passages quoted do not justify the suspicion; on the contrary, they are of a nature to put it entirely at rest. But the National Society's Central School is the model institution which other schools in union propose to imitate, and we gladly profit by the opportunity of showing what is done at that place. The following summary was placed in the hands of a gentleman as an answer to an inquiry he made on this point:—

" In the Central School religious exercises occupy a considerable portion of the school hours, &c.

" *Reading*:—The Holy Scriptures; Wells' Geography; Sellon's Abridgement; Le Bas on Scripture Types and Prophecies; Ostervald's Abridgement, and other Tracts, chiefly relating to Scripture History; also, the Elements of Grammar.

" *Writing*:—Copies; keeping registers of progress; employment of time, &c.; entering sums; accounts, &c.

" *Ciphering*:—Arithmetic, including vulgar and decimal fractions; the square root; elements of geometry, &c.

" *Geography*:—Wells, with the maps; maps of St. Paul's travels; the globe,—Europe,—the British isles, &c.

" History and biography are not professedly taught, but are incidentally introduced in the exercises on geography, and the fulfilment of prophecy respecting nations, &c.

" *Music*:—Elements of; Psalmody; Turner's Manual. The children, as well as the masters and mistresses in training, learn the notes.

" The children have the privilege of a lending library, selected from the Catalogue of the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge.

" The masters in training, and the senior boys, have access to a more extensive library; and to facilitate the acquirement of useful knowledge, their attention is directed to such books as may assist them in the study of history, grammar, geography, geometry, &c.; such as, Natural Philosophy, Treatise on Geometry, Martin's Philosophical Grammar, Blunt on the Reformation, History of England, Pursuit of Knowledge, Bingley's Useful Knowledge, Bingley's Travellers, Readings in Biography, &c."

Is this instruction of a stinted kind? Is there matter sufficient here to exercise the youthful mind during the full period that the

children of the working classes are commonly allowed by their parents, or by their necessary avocations in life, to remain at school? If such knowledge is communicated accurately and perfectly, is there not abundance of occupation here? And, if we have a moral result to show, or, if we have the evidence of competent witnesses (in the persons of the clergy) to vouch for it, have we reason to be dissatisfied with what has already been done? Certain we are, that those who consider the matter soberly and deliberately, looking into the subject and judging for themselves, however they may desire (as we ourselves most heartily desire) for improvement of every kind, will not consider that it is little which has been effected for education, or that sweeping and wholesale changes are necessary before England can be said to have schools for the poor. If erroneous impressions on this subject have got abroad *to any considerable extent*, (which appears very doubtful, notwithstanding the loudness of voice with which certain opinions have been proclaimed,) we are satisfied they have been produced by misrepresentations on the subject, which it is an imperative duty to expose. Gladly would we forego the invidious task of laying open to public view the very serious charges which attach to those who have put themselves foremost in the cry lately raised against existing schools, and the demand for others of a different sort; who require, not only that intellectual pursuits shall have a principal degree of attention in such new institutions, but that religion shall be excluded, at least religion under any particular form. We are well aware of the charge to which we make ourselves liable, the imputation of bigotry, of intolerance, of fear, of jealousy, and such like unworthy feelings, but it is a very small thing that we should be judged of men when the dearest interests of the people and the country are at stake.

We, therefore, propose to state some facts with regard to the Central Education Society, which appear to us to substantiate the serious charges already advanced against it in the House of Lords, and the allegations of the petition which was presented in that place. Upon a careful survey of the two productions* which that Society has put forth, we hold that those charges were by no means such as might have been advanced. The religious bearings of the Society were then chiefly considered; whereas, we may show from the evidence which its own publications afford, not only, first, that its proceedings are objectionable in a religious light; but that, secondly, its works abound in mistaken and partial views of education in general; thirdly, in proofs of ignorance, especially unbecoming those who pretend to set others right;

* Its "First Publication," and "Schools for the Working Classes, or, the Present State of Education among the Working People of England."

fourthly, in distinct indications of prejudice against the Church of England; and, fifthly, in an obvious want of candour and truth.

If the Society had confined itself, as it professes to do, to the publishing of information and statistical details, there can be no question that it might have effected considerable good, and that its proceedings would have gained the thanks of all, including the members of the National Church. And, so far as its labours of this description have gone, we are not disposed to complain. The former and the present condition of schools abroad;—the analysis and exhibition of laborious reports which are only accessible to the few,—facts respecting crime and education in France and other countries, or the social condition of the working classes at home, such like matters must produce interest, without exciting angry feelings; and if the Society had confined itself to such matters, it might have been well. But, even in producing these there is a pretension to novelty and to discovery, which is somewhat unbecoming in persons who are only reporting on the labours of other men, and there is a disregard to order and arrangement in the papers, which is far from creditable to the editors, though it may, indeed, be convenient as a cover for the opinions and assertions which the Society had no business, consistently with its professed character, to advance.

How far any pretensions to novelty or discovery may become the writers, or rather the editors, of such a work, can only be judged of by those to whom the history of schools is really known.

For ourselves, on turning accidentally to some notes which we made on occasion of an educational excursion to the British Museum a few years since, we were struck by a curious agreement between the Central Society's list of subjects discussed in 1837, and our own memorandum of topics, chiefly interesting to the public and the friends of education some hundred years ago. We are disposed to think, that if any one lays the following list, which is taken from our notes, by the side of the table of contents in the modern work, he will not suppose that imagination has been unduly at work in discovering the resemblance referred to :—

“ ‘The Way of Teaching the Latin Tongue.’ Ascham, 1751.

“ ‘Examination of Academies.’ 1753. And, ‘Advice for the Advancement of Real Learning, by W. P.’

“ ‘Petition of Grammar Schools to be released from all Rules, and have the Benefit of their Apprenticeships and Trades, as though they had served their Time and duly Studied at the University.’ 1642.

“ ‘An Academy wherein Young Ladies may be preserved and secured till the Day of their Marriage . . . , under a grave Society of Virgins who have resolved to live in a single retired way, &c.’ 1671.

“ ‘A Mite into the Treasury, being a Word to . . . the Heptatechnists.’ 1680.

“ ‘The Brains-breakers’ Breaker, or, the Apology of Thomas Grantham, &c.’ 1644.

“ ‘Efforts of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge to improve Education in Workhouses, and to connect Works of Industry with Schools, with Statistical Tables of the Schools.’ Reports.

“ ‘Mr. Nedham’s Discourse and Appeal.’ 1663. Parliament exhorted to inquire into the Abuses of Endowments ;—Uniformity in Books enforced ;—Suggestions for the Improved Employment of Parish Clerks ;—Plan for bringing the Fellows of Colleges out into the World and making them Work ;—Increased efficiency of the Universities thereby ;—Abolition of Whipping, &c. &c.”

The last work is by far the most complete of its kind, and develops its plan of national improvement to an extent which is quite remarkable, considering the day when it appeared. Like its successors in criticism too, it dwells with great force on the remissness and indifference of mankind to the training of the young ; reminding us quaintly how true it is ;—

“ Nulla res minoris
Constabit patri quam filius.”

“ Nothing shall stand the thrifty dad
In less, than training of his lad ;”

and bewailing the miserable estate of schoolmasters with the contempt in which their office was held ;—so that the proverb appeared to be verified to the letter,—

“ Quem Jupiter odit, pædagogum facit.”

“ To whom a spite Jove takes
Him pedagogue he makes.”

But we are by no means disposed to trifle with a subject of so serious a nature, or to imagine that we should be justified in supporting by any thing like ridicule the very grievous charges that have been advanced against a publication, the papers of which bear the names of many respectable and influential persons. To facts, then, we recur :—I. We object altogether to *the religious views, or rather the total want of religious views*, in the publications of the Central Society of Education. The principle avowed in the following passage is of course repugnant to the feelings of every friend of the Church :—

“ Important a part of education as religion forms, it is one upon which the Society, if it intends to effect good, must observe a strict neutrality ; religious controversy must be avoided. The contributions to the publications of the Society must, therefore, be confined to observations upon the cultivation of religious sentiments, without touching upon points of difference. The Society cannot allow the Church of England, the Church

of Scotland, the Church of Rome, or any class of Dissenters, to be attacked through its pages, for it has an assurance that if this rule is ever deviated from, they will become either an arena for opposing sects to contend in ; or, what is more likely, the representative of the opinions of one."—pp. 9, 10.

The following words have, indeed, a cheering sound, but betray a lamentable ignorance of the real corrective of all human sorrows and infirmities ;—we must assume, in the absence of all other instruction connected with religion, that this, and the annexed passage, contain the substitute which is proposed instead of the consolations of the Holy Spirit, and the correcting and renewing efficacy of divine grace :—

" England must not only be moral, industrious, intelligent, powerful England, but cheerful, happy England. The lively song must be heard again,—the active sport must be called back,—marked days must be kept as periodical remembrances of friendship and good will, when quarrels should be made up, and the peace of families restored. If you would do a thing, there is nothing like a fixed time for doing it in ; and although we would be good friends at all times, differences will arise ; therefore, let us have fixed periods for cementing old friendships and making new ones. . . . In France, New Year's day is a day for making up all quarrels and disagreements,—the interchanging of little presents,—things of no value but as proceeding from a kindly spirit."—p. 176.

" 'The prodigious effects of education,' says David Hume, 'may convince us, that the mind is not altogether stubborn and inflexible, but will admit of many alterations from its original make and structure. Let a man propose to himself the model of a character which he approves,—let him be well acquainted with those particulars in which his own character deviates from this model,—let him keep a constant watch over himself, and bend his mind, by a continual effort, from the vices towards the virtues,—and I doubt not but in time he will find in his temper an alteration for the better.'—*We can add nothing to this*, nothing in reference either to the value of education, as the great lever with which to raise the social mass, or to its humbler but rare influence when well directed *to check, and finally even to triumph over, criminal passions and desires.*"—!!!—p. 289.

We leave the question of religion for the present, merely setting in contrast with these passages the more full and perfect scheme which we propose to ourselves in the training of children, as it is expressed in the words of one whose scientific honours entitle him to be heard and respected when he speaks in this cause:

" The great secret of right training lies in the always regarding the child as immortal. The moment that this is kept out of sight, we scheme and arrange as though the child had to live only upon earth ; and then our plans, not being commensurate with the destinies of their object, will necessarily be inadequate to the securing its good. Educate on the principle that you educate for eternity—otherwise it is impossible, that,

with all your pains, you should produce a beneficial result. If you educate only for the time ; if you do not take care that every thing else shall be manifestly subordinate to preparation for an after-state of being ; you virtually impress upon the young a lesson as to the importance of this world, irrespective of the next ; and they will not be slow in inferring, however you may occasionally read them a lecture on religion, that you attach, in reality, a greater worth to earthly things than you seem willing in theory to allow. Whereas, if you contrive to make it evident, throughout the whole process of education, that you have but one aim, and that the aim of fitting for death and for judgment, the strong likelihood is, that the child will become so impressed with the importance of this aim, as to acquire a habit of taking it for its own.

“ We know, of course, what will be immediately urged against such a theory of education as this. We shall be accused of rejecting all knowledge which is not strictly religious, and of laying an interdict upon various acquirements, and still more upon various accomplishments. But the accusation is unfounded, and shows forgetfulness or ignorance of a great truth, namely, that religion adds a fresh interest to every thing worth knowing, and a fresh grace to every thing worth doing.”—*Rev. H. Melvill's Sermon*, 1838, pp. 13, 14.

But the feelings of the Central Society are more fully developed in its Second Publication. In that work, the objections to teaching writing on the Lord's day are held up to ridicule as the peculiar notions of the evangelical party in the Church, though it is an objection with all, pp. 13, 14 : the efforts of a dissenting school at Stockport, where the contrary plan is pursued, are approved, p. 15 : we have a kind of joke set forth in the country-fied speech of a poor Sunday-schoolmaster who had lost the help of the curate's daughters by their death, (probably, it is suggested, from attending the school), p. 14 : sneers are thrown out against Sunday-school teachers, than whom there is hardly a more devoted class of people in the country, p. 16 : and the natural indisposition of the heart to religion, which a Sunday-school Society had described in the very words of the Bible, is brought forward as a plain proof that the instruction given in the school must be wretchedly bad, because it is so distasteful to the children.

II. Independently of religion, the work *abounds in partial and mistaken views* of the subject of which it treats. A specimen only can be given here.

The system of composition and other exercises in our higher class of schools are objected to, and something which may turn more easily and readily to account in the world is proposed, p. 8 ; as though the immediate fruits of knowledge, instead of the discipline of the mind, were the thing to be desired in schools. And

on this kind of foundation, a good deal of what is plausible is made to rest.

Of a similar nature are the following propositions, which will doubtless be new to many of our readers. "The studies of young persons are for the purpose . . . of giving them a lively interest in the world they are entering upon, (compare 1 John, ii. 15—17); . . . they are too for enabling their parents and preceptors to discover what the peculiar bents of their minds are, so that the study chosen for them may be one in which they will probably succeed," p. 9. In pursuance of this principle, it is proposed "to introduce professional studies into preparatory education, and thus familiarise the mind to the peculiar class of ideas which, in after life, must so greatly occupy it," p. 19. "At present (we are told) all early associations receive a shock;" viz. by the change in the subject of study as life advances; "such is the position of a young man who comes from the successful prosecution of his educational studies to a conveyancer's or special pleader's chambers"!!

These principles, be it remembered, are taken from the leading article in the publication which sets forth the Society's designs. And, who indeed shall wonder to find such recommendations, when he knows the definition of education which a chief mover in the Society (Mr. Wyse) deliberately propounds in his writings?—"that which enables each citizen most perfectly to fulfil the various duties which his several stations in society, public and private, enforce upon him, by giving to the physical, intellectual, and moral faculties, the full perfection of which they are susceptible," (*without the remotest reference to the ultimate destinies of man.*)

Need we adduce further instances of partial and mistaken views, when a society for improving the education of the country proceeds on such principles as these?

III. There are *proofs of ignorance* in the publications unbecoming any persons who ought to understand a subject upon which they write, and more especially unseemly in those who profess to teach the teachers of England what things they should do. It may seem a small thing in the eyes of the public, but those who understand the system of education now at work in the country will not deem it such, that the idea of selecting teachers (monitors) out of the class they are to teach, is held up to ridicule.* Why, where is the thing done? The rule and principle of the system is, that monitors shall always be taken from the first or highest class.—So, the circulating system is praised because there is no bottom to the class, and the worst scholar is spared the re-

* Schools for the Industrious Classes, p. 28.

proach of standing the last ; whereas the system is objectionable for this very reason, that the worst scholar is driven down, circle after circle, and bears on his breast a badge indicative of his disgrace ; and the best scholar is tempted to pride by the list of honorary circles which he moves up, and proclaims by his badge. In short, so far from avoiding depression, the principle of excitement and depression is too strongly and largely introduced into the whole school.

What else can we account it but a proof of ignorance, that while much is said of lending libraries, and, in describing the Ealing* school, we have an account (as a novelty !) of a *boy librarian*, no reference is made to the very numerous libraries in connexion with existing national schools, together with the plan of acting through the medium of children, and teaching them to be useful in every possible way, which is the very essence of the system of mutual tuition, viz. that the children are to work all the mechanical details of the school business, and the master is to be free to superintend and direct and control the whole.

In like manner, evening instruction in connexion with Sunday or daily national schools, is treated as a novelty, a sort of discovery. Again, a kind of apprenticeship system in connexion with schools, which the National Society's reports had long since told us was tried at Liverpool and at York, is brought forward as a new idea.† So also, a whole essay is devoted to vocal music considered as a branch of national education, without a syllable to indicate that a work‡ has been expressly prepared for effecting this very thing which is desired in national schools ; that there had been a great demand for the work ; that singing has been taught scientifically in the Marylebone, and Philological, and Clergy Orphan Schools, and is actually in operation at the National Society's Central School. If it is not attributable to ignorance, that the results of other men's labours are passed over thus, we fear that some motive of a more objectionable description must be assigned. Again ; who would have supposed from the article, "Industrial Schools for the Peasantry," that the whole subject had been fully and impartially considered by the National Society, the principles carried out extensively into effect, and a Report printed on the subject many years ago. For ourselves, we do not scruple to assert, that the paper on works of industry connected with National Schools put forth by the Society in 1833, contains far more information, more clearly and systematically arranged, than the essay composed expressly in 1837 for the purpose of showing

* First Publication, p. 188.

† Schools for the Industrious Classes, pp. 70, 71.

‡ Manual of Instruction in Psalmody. By J. Turner, Esq. Published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

how little has been done in this particular department, and enlightening the public on the subject. We are tempted to give the following abstract in proof of what we state;—

“ The Society’s publication gives the objections and the answers against and for the plan of industrial schools; it then gives an interesting specimen of what may be effected, by an account of the Royal Military School at Chelsea; and it afterwards enlarges, with many particular and useful hints, on the following works, which are more or less adapted to the object desired:—*Needlework*, with details of the Rutland Society, its prizes and plan of operations; *Household-work*, with accounts from the poor reports, vol. vi.; *Knitting*, as practised by boys, as well as girls, in many national schools; *Netting*, with an account of its success in Northleach school; *Tailors’ work*, practised in several national schools; *Straw-platting*, with particulars respecting the plat; *Spinning, weaving and winding*, as in the Hastings, Glasbury and Rutland schools, &c.; *Covering and stitching books*, as in the Twickenham school; *Printing*, with particulars from Gower’s Walk; *Basket-making*; account from the Liverpool Blind Asylum; *Rush-platting for mats, baskets, &c.*; *Gardening and agriculture*, with details from the Thames Ditton school. Under the last head, is a reference to the village agricultural school at Carra, near Geneva, established by M. Vernet, a relative of the late professor Pictet, which the Central Society of Education announces as the school of M. Vernet Pietat.”—*First Publication*, p. 204.

When, therefore, the Society tells us, “ such, as far as they have come to our knowledge, are the first attempts which have been made in the country ”* of this kind, we can only lament that the books of the National Society were not consulted before the labours of the institution were misrepresented and spoken of with contempt. When it informs us, that “ in national schools works of industry may be introduced, without affecting their exclusive character,”—we ask the Society’s editor, did you never read what was put forth in the First Publication of the National Society, and has been always reprinted with the paper on the subject since 1833 ?

“ It may not be superfluous, to call the attention of the public to this peculiar advantage resulting from its admirable mechanism, that the instruction necessary for the lower orders of society is so expeditiously afforded, as to leave ample leisure for the daily exercise of manual labour. . . . A conviction of the superabundance of time at the disposal of schoolmasters, has induced the managers of certain schools to seek for variety of employment,” &c.

Or, has the work-book of the Society never fallen in his way? wherein we read on the first page,—

“ At the Central School, all the regulations respecting needlework and knitting are formed on the principles of the Madras system, as

* First Publication, p. 201.

taught in Dr. Bell's Manual of Instructions. . . . The children are classed according to their proficiency in needlework, &c. . . . an assistant teacher to each of the three sides of the class, . . . a teacher superintends the whole, . . . is responsible to the schoolmistress for all," &c.

And, whose thanks, then, does he expect, for announcing the mysterious discovery that works of industry are not inconsistent with the principles of mutual instruction, or the exclusive (religious?) character of our schools? Whatever the friends of the Central Society may feel, we are sure that the public may be somewhat surprised to know that some of the institutions he sets out in array for their instruction and imitation, such as Springfield,* Winkfield,† &c. are in union with the National Society, and were actually established by aid of the Society's own funds.

We have none of the vain ambition of arrogating all inventions and improvements to the Church by these remarks. We are simply stating facts which may be verified by public documents, and by which our character for truth may stand or fall.

IV. But there are proofs against the Central Society of *prejudice against the Church*. For instance, we deem it such to describe both societies, National and British, as the patrons of intellectual instruction‡ only, (which is not correct); and after praising the British Central School for its superiority, to lament that no attention is paid in it to *singing*, and neglect to state that its rival gives an example in this respect!—And, to dwell upon the provision which might be made for mechanics by books and reading-rooms, without any notice of what has been effected by the National Society's agents in this way at Bath, and Chichester, and Coventry, and elsewhere!§ Do the friends of Church schools admit, that “the number of schools, not the quality of instruction given in them,”|| has hitherto been the subject of their appeal? Then, why charge against them so offensive a statement, which cannot be substantiated when denied? “Trinitarians and Unitarians,” the public are informed, “find it impossible to unite even for teaching reading and writing and arithmetic.”¶ “Children's feelings are embittered by theological controversy in our schools.”** Is this to hold off from the subject of religion, and observe neutrality,—or to attack the chief patrons of religious instruction, the friends of the Church? So we are informed that Mr. Lancaster established “the model school in the Borough Road. Subsequently, Dr. Bell came over from Madras.”†† It is difficult to conceive any other motive for such an assertion than

* First Publication, p. 192.

† p. 189.

‡ pp. 172, 173.

§ p. 2.

|| See National Society's Report, 1837, pp. 50, 57, 62, &c.

¶ Schools for the Industrious Classes, p. 8.

** p. 10.

†† p. 21.

a design of traducing the pretensions of the Church. In the like spirit we are told, that the sum total of the instruction given at the Central School is of such and such a kind,* a quotation being made from the Society's Report ;—we turn to the Report, and find that the fact is not so, but it is stated, that every child is expected to know the matters (religious) referred to, while other lessons are always taught. In a like spirit, a little book on arithmetic, which contains some examples from Scriptural facts, is ridiculed as most unfit for use in the Central School, and the *reverend* secretary of the Society, who compiled it, is sufficiently jeered. Who would suppose, after this, that the book never has been, and probably never will be, used in the Central School at all? Yet, such is the fact. Who would imagine that the title-page and first words of the preface proclaim that the book was written with another design, and is not adapted for general use in schools? It is written for adults, to *explain the "first principles of a science which they are to teach others,"* and *not for the children.*

In the article on the progress and prospects of education in the United Kingdom, the writer devotes a large space (eighteen pages) to Scotch schools, half as much to Irish schools, and, when he comes to those of England and Wales, laments that "the limits of his paper preclude the possibility of going into detail respecting them."† But there were other obvious reasons why it was inconvenient to do this. He would have had to tell (as the extract we have already given shows) of the indefatigable exertions of the Church of England and the clergy in this work. Or else, where English education is the chief object of the Central Society's regard, why did he pass over the very matter on which it was important that he should touch?

V. With regard to *the want of candour and truth* which is betrayed in many parts of the Society's two works, we may refer briefly to the hasty admissions which are constantly made of what the Church has done, and which are uniformly followed by a virtual contradiction of the admission in the form of uncompromising abuse of her schools.‡ The Second Publication is described in the following words by a review, which generally approves of the object with which the Society was formed.

"The author in it has carried out the statistical system with a vengeance, and with irresistible drollery given the examination of the fifty-three witnesses for National School Education; consisting of all the low idle vagabonds that could be pounced upon in the public streets. From the mouths of these witnesses the education of the National and British and Foreign Schools is adjudged to be worse than no education at all;

* Schools for the Industrious Classes, p. 26.

† First Publication, p. 58.

‡ See pp. 11, 28, 29, 277, &c.

and the author indulges himself in many deprecatory remarks on the National and British systems in a manner so outrageous and vulgar, as to be disgusting to the reader, and offensive to every well-regulated mind. Much that is embodied in the pamphlet is undoubtedly true ; but you may speak truth with a view to offend, or with a view to amend : the author has chosen the former method."

A violent attack is made in this work upon the school in Baldwin's Gardens, which was formerly the National Society's Central School. The secretaries, who gratuitously devote their time and services to the schools, have thought it deserving of an answer. Other persons have not done so in their own case ; but we may judge by this example of the violence done to the feelings of benevolent people through the hasty and unfounded abuse which, if we may not say the Central Society has sanctioned, yet for which it is made responsible, through the editors it appoints.

"A pamphlet has recently been published under the sanction of the Central Society of Education, entitled 'Schools for the Industrious Classes,' which abounds with the most exaggerated statements respecting existing schools, and the present system of education throughout the country ; and as the author has made several direct and specific charges against the National School in Baldwin's Gardens, we have thought it our duty, by showing the unfounded nature of these charges, to satisfy the minds of the supporters of this Institution in particular, and at the same time to put readers in general on their guard, as to the credit which is due to other parts of the work.

"The first statement, to which we will reply, is in the following words :—

" 'The utility of the school in Baldwin's Gardens, in the midst of a dense Irish population, is almost destroyed by the narrow and contracted basis upon which the school is established. Although there are one or two catholic boys in the school, hundreds who would attend are kept away by their priests, who, as might have been expected, denounce (and not unreasonably) parents who suffer their children to attend and join in an anti-catholic form of worship.'—*Second Edit.* p. 22.

"This statement can only have originated in the desire, obvious through the whole book, to depreciate by every possible means the usefulness and efficiency of existing schools. A very short answer will suffice. The school is not situated in the midst of a dense Irish population ; there are very few Irish families in its immediate vicinity on any side ; and, moreover, the number of Roman Catholics in the school is greatly understated ; there are now nearly thirty children of Irish and Italian parents in the school, one or both of whose parents are, it is believed, Roman Catholics, and there are also a good many children of Dissenters and Jews ; but if it were otherwise, the usefulness of the school could not on that account be justly impugned, for there are as many children in it as the rooms are calculated to accommodate, and they are frequently crowded to inconvenience."

The second charge is refuted as fully and plainly as the former.

Having alluded to the opinion expressed in the upper House of Parliament respecting this Society, we must here add, that whatever noble lords, who are friendly to its principles, (which we have illustrated through the medium of its own statements,) may say, there "must be a feeling of distrust in the public mind in regard to its operations." We cannot admit that "its publications are put forth *merely* as means of acquainting the public with the various propositions which have been made with regard to education."* It could have been nothing but want of information which induced a noble advocate to say, that "in these publications the utmost care has been taken to abstain from the expression of opinion, but the greatest anxiety is manifested to provide facts and information from which important conclusions may be drawn."

It is not needful for us to express any further opinion on the Central Society. But there are some inferences deducible from the attacks of this Association, and of various other persons or parties who are like-minded with it, which it would not become us to pass over entirely.

The Church and the Clergy are not in good odour with those we refer to, because they have done and are doing too much to suit their views and desires. The Church has an influence and connexion formed throughout the country which they find very embarrassing. *Their* "schemes would go far towards dissociating religion from the instruction given to the people. We, therefore, regard those schemes as hostile to the Christianity of our land;" and our exertions in behalf of this same religion are equally opposed to their plans. We would have our schools to be, "as those of Edward VI. and of Elizabeth were before them, the feeders of the Established Church;" and, if the members of that Church are true to their own cause, there is nothing to prevent the main body of schools throughout the country being of this description. This fact being pretty well understood in the present day, there is nothing left to prevent such a result, but to attack the character of existing schools; to endeavour to make out a case of misapplication in regard to the charitable endowments which were left to the Church for its special benefit; and, assuming as a fact that the Church is contented with the present state of educational affairs, to call upon authorities to wrest her power from her hands, or else, to create such a controlling influence as shall virtually destroy that power. We have so often

* Mirror, Part 442, pp. 274, 275.

had occasion to expose these views and designs, that we deem it irrelevant to recite our arguments :* but it is due to the National Society to state distinctly, that it has proclaimed, as plainly as words can express, that it is by no means satisfied, as a final result, with what has been done hitherto. There is a long passage from its annual Report, in our article referred to, in which it expressly says as much. That passage is brought forward, and urged again on public attention in the Society's Report for 1835, p. 17. 'The extraordinary want of schools, as proved by the Education-inquiry, 1833, is pointed out, Report 1836. The declaration is renewed in a statement transmitted to the Chancellor of the Exchequer on Model Schools, and printed in Report for 1836, p. 57. Plans are repeatedly suggested for improving schools; the necessity of better salaries, for an improved set of teachers, is urged, Report, 1835; and the Queen's Letter, recently in the course of circulation throughout the country, recited the Society's own feeling complaint and prayer, that its hands might be strengthened, in order that its work might be better accomplished.

But the importance of the subject has betrayed us to an undue length, and our remarks must be brought to a close. We have only room to enumerate what we proposed to have discussed at some length, as a sequel to the preceding remarks; viz. first, the schemes for the improvement of education which are afloat; secondly, the bearings of those schemes, which are fatal, as we apprehend, to their success: and, thirdly, the course which we hope, and are disposed to think, the government will adopt.

We have read of four schemes differing a little in the extent of their interference with existing plans and institutions. Of these we enumerate, 1st, as requiring the greatest changes, that which the Central Society propounds.

It can "anticipate no measures equal to the emergency of the case unless the subject be taken up by her majesty's government."† "Central national organization is the great thing;" "a proper department with a minister and council are required"—"large powers over new and old endowments."‡ It doubts whether the country would, for the present, "permit a system of compulsory education to be adopted;" but suggests some intermediate measures. . . . "The government may hold out civil advantages to those who have been educated, and impose disabilities on those who have not, &c. . . . A law might then be passed, without difficulty, which would lay the foundation of the . . . prosperity of the country.§ So that compulsory education (which is defended by the practice of the Court of

* See particularly our article IX., in No. XXXV. for July, 1835.

† First Publication, p. 212.

‡ pp. 62, 63.

§ p. 14.

Chancery in certain particulars) is the one thing needed and desired; and the adoption of local taxes for the purpose at once is deliberately proposed."§

2. Lord Brougham's plan stands next, which, being embodied in the form of a bill, is sufficiently before the public. It rejects all ideas of direct compulsion, proposes a commission with extensive duties,—a system of enrolling schools under the Commission, by which they shall become entitled to certain privileges;—officers, called inspectors of schools;—special arrangements for the benefit of towns having municipal corporations; and various other details. A kind of commentary, favourable to the bill, has appeared in the last *Edinburgh Review*; and its supposed defects have been pointed out in the Preface to Mr. L. Horner's translation of M. Cousin's work on the schools of Holland.

3. A more moderate scheme, as regards the degree of interference with existing institutions, has been put forth in the *Educational Magazine*, and is stated thus:

"We think that under the present circumstances of the country much can be done. Education must be made a government measure, which should be as ready to prevent crime as to punish it. Let societies exist, and let the government work through them, with a proviso that certain branches of education shall be imparted; and that certain institutions, Normal schools, shall be raised for the full and competent training of teachers. Let the Church have their schools, and the Dissenters have their schools; but let the government compel both to carry out comprehensive plans, and insist upon the elements of geography and English history, linear drawing, and the first truths of natural philosophy, being taught by the aid of books properly drawn up, pictures, maps, lessons, and apparatus. Let the government provide funds, and state what they would have done, and there will be no difficulty. Let them prohibit sham schools being formed, in which the word of promise is kept to the ear, but broken to the hope. Let inspectors be selected to examine every school at stated periods; and let there be a proper scale of payment for teachers, and a provision for old age. But let no teacher be elected without having passed a board of examiners, such as a young surgeon is obliged to undergo."

4. We certainly were surprised to find that our own pages had unintentionally given birth to a scheme at all, but the Secretary of the British and Foreign School Society has called us in to subserve his own opinions, and he is welcome to such aid as he can borrow from us, though we see obvious difficulties in his proposal.

"An idea has been thrown out in a number of the *British Critic*, which strikes me as worthy of regard, viz., the appointment of a Minister

† First Publication, p. 23.

of Public Instruction, not indeed a Schoolmaster-General of the kingdom, but to form a connecting link between the government and the country, holding a *bureau* of central communication and general intercourse; the visitor for statistical purposes of all Public Seminaries and Educational Establishments; a collector of educational facts, and a depository of educational suggestions, with a view to the supply of deficiencies and the extension of benefits. If, under the control of such an officer of state, three working commissioners were appointed, one to represent the interests of the National Society, one connected with the British and Foreign School Society, and one selected to represent the opinions of those gentlemen who are not disposed to approve of either, and if all applications for aid, whether from the two societies or elsewhere, were thoroughly investigated by them, I think that without the help of any penalties they might obtain access for their inspectors to almost every school in the kingdom,—might elevate and improve existing establishments, and, in connection with local effort, promote to an unlimited extent the opening of new ones. Understanding, as they would, the grounds on which voluntary subscriptions are offered, they would be able not only to secure the present amount of contributions, but to develop still more widely the benevolent resources of the country.”*

What shall we argue from such a multiplicity of plans?—Certainly not that the remedy for the supposed disease is simple and sure;—not that the practitioners understand the case. Each takes great pains to show that his own advice is right, and that the others are wrong. The Central Society would do away with existing societies altogether; Lord Brougham would have the power of controlling or superseding their operations, or leaving them to their own unaided exertions, as the commissioners might think fit. The third scheme (inconsistently enough) would preserve them as voluntary agents, but fetter them with laws,—Mr. Dunn would identify them with the government itself. Other discrepancies in abundance may be pointed out in their plans; it is enough for us to see that “doctors differ,” and we infer that they do not understand the disease of the patient,—they all promise to cure. But we have no space to discuss the respective merits of the plans. They all involve expenses which must be fatal to their success when brought under the Chancellor of the Exchequer’s eyes;—and they all involve religious considerations which must be equally fatal to them with the country at large. We have already shown at what price the country is to buy the advantages which are promised on the good faith of speculators who, we doubt not, believe every word they say. Centralized organization may be had for a few hundred thousands pounds a year, or in terms more emphatic, “England’s intellectual regeneration may be effected for the

* National Education the Question of Questions, by Mr. Henry Dunn, 1838.

mere sum it cost us to set free our West Indian slaves?" If this were all, we apprehend the House of Commons would consider it enough, but the Central Society of Education would be very far from content. Besides what this involves, it has nobler schemes in view;*—the salaries for the teachers must not be what they now are, *but good*;—there must be various collateral aids in the work;—"schools of design," with normal schools;—special aid for mechanics' institutes;—museums throughout the country furnished forth by the state;—schools for the special benefit of juvenile offenders, "houses of detention" they are to be called, where the unfortunate children may be supported and trained, and sent out into the world reformed characters;—there is moreover a workhouse scheme, and a scheme for providing new courts in large towns, under another responsible minister of justice, who should have gaols under his control, &c.

Away then with the calculating economy of modern times!—Let the means be supplied, and let education do its perfect work! We should really anticipate great results from men of such splendid comprehensive views, if we did not observe that the whole expense was to be thrown upon the shoulders of government, and that the advocates of the measures themselves hold their own purses very tightly clasped. We scarcely remember a popular society which has come forward with such magnificent pretensions, and such straightened resources, as this same Central Society from which all these plans proceed.

But if this, or any other of the projected societies, were prepared to do its own work, and pay for the expenses it occasions, we apprehend that a voice would be heard from the religious portion of the community, which would cause very formidable obstructions in its proceedings. It has a plausible sound, in a parliamentary debate, when it is said, the schools shall be religious schools, the Bible shall be read, all children shall of necessity study it, except, perhaps, a few Roman Catholics or Jews, whose parents may object. But, such kind of accommodation and concession falls very far short of the requirements which thoughtful religious persons are prepared to make. They choose that religion, the religion of Christ Jesus, in a distinct substantive form, should not be hooked on as a collateral branch of tuition, an appendage in its train, but should form the basis and groundwork of the business of the schools. They will not submit "to substitute secular knowledge as the refining principle of the country, for the wisdom which is from above: or compendiums of political economy for the word

* First Publication; see the plans in succession, pp. 41, 244, 250, 251, 281, 282, 283, 290, &c.

of God.”* They despise “those much vaunted systems which deal with the intellect and let alone the heart, or propose to polish the metal without attempting to refine it.”† They require that, in all education, the corruptions of our nature, and the immortality of our souls, should be the first elements taken into account; and, therefore, they make the intellectual advancement of the pupil subordinate to his moral improvement; yet though subordinate, they would not have it overlooked, “for whatever principle serves to kill the lusts of the heart, serves to open the eyes of the understanding too.” “Man arrives at the highest intellectual elevation of which he is capable through the cultivation of his moral affections.” The language of Scripture and the language of the world are opposed. “*Wisdom*, as understood in the Bible, is a principle of fear and love working in God’s creatures. *Knowledge*, is a knowledge of God, of his nature and attributes, of his claims upon us and our duties to him; and other acquirements, even those upon which the world spends all its strength, are there sunk and disregarded, as vain.”‡ The object of those who have hitherto been the chief promoters of education, has been to teach men to make a conscience of their ways, and to prepare and qualify them for that state which shall then only begin when the transitory things of this present world have all passed away. Nor will they, for the hope of any temporal and intellectual advantages, forego any portion of this great and important design. For this purpose, to satisfy their own consciences that they may do the work of God, not deceitfully, but fully and effectually to the saving of souls, they must have all those manifold truths unfolded to the understanding of their pupils, so far as the wisdom of God has seen fit to direct.—“True,” say the advocates for the school of universal adaptation,—“true, have religious instruction as much as you please, but do not adopt any particular form of faith; take the general principles of Christianity which are best suited to a general plan of education; but do not obtrude on all scholars the peculiar principles of the Church of England;—be content with the general principles of the Church of Christ.”

“But I ask in the first place, how are these general principles *to be applied*; for it is with their application that we are here concerned?—I may have general notions of a house, but I must have a specific plan when I build one. I may have general notions of astronomy, but I must adopt a specific system when I teach it: and I may have general

* See an admirable sermon by Rev. J. J. Blunt. “Useful Knowledge no Substitute for Religious Knowledge, in a scheme for National Education.” Murray.

† Sermon by Rev. H. Melvill. “Religious Education.” Rivingtons.

‡ Blunt’s Sermon.

ideas of Christianity, but I must prefer one mode of it to another, when I set myself to form a Christian. But I would further ask, what those general principles of Christianity are of which we hear so much?—I find all Christians, to be sure, professing to acknowledge the Bible for their common authority: yet, whilst they do so, I find some denying their original sin; some the Godhead of the Son; some the need or efficacy of the atonement; some the influence, some the very being of the Holy Ghost. I find some declaring against the baptism of infants; some against elemental baptism at all; some against the supper of the Lord, as commemorative of the *sacrifice* of Christ's death. I find some for many sacraments; some for none whatever. I find some for an ordained ministry, as the covenanted channel through which God's special grace has been conveyed to his people from the apostles downwards; and some for allowing any man to take the honour to himself *not* as did Aaron. Now I would know what kind of Christianity that would be, and whether it would be of a kind to satisfy St. Paul, which must be so indefinite in its character, in its nature so abstract, as to be consistent with the suppression, for the sake of peace, of all mention of the corruption of man, of the Godhead of the Son, of the atonement of his blood, of the person and office of the Comforter, of baptism, of the supper of the Lord, of a priesthood. Doubtless, as much as in us lies, we are to live peacefully with all men, but the restriction implies that peace, though more to be desired than gold, may like gold be bought too dear. If there are texts which teach concession, there are others (though in these days much less heard of) which teach steadfastness; though *unity* is the second thing in the world to long for, still *truth* is the first. But follow the principle out, and it would deprive us of the use of even Scripture itself as an element of education; for if no one mode of interpreting Scripture is to be resolved on, because there are those who do not allow that interpretation; so neither should Scripture itself be *admitted* into our schools, because there are those who dispute its truths."—*Rev. J. J. Blunt's Sermon.*

We have nothing to add to these sensible observations excepting this, that Mr. Dunn's remarks (in his essay, entitled *National Education the Question of Questions*, especially where he deals with the religious difficulties of the case, and speaks of the Bible as an universal text-book, adapted to the use of all schools,) are a practical illustration of the truth of what Mr. Blunt asserts. In pp. 34, 35, his treatment of the Catholic, the Unitarian, the Jew (not to name the unbeliever), is a clear proof that there is no such thing as a Christianity for schools which can be suitable or palatable to all. Any violent attempt to force a system upon the country which should involve this absurdity, must necessarily have the effect of rendering the existing societies of education still more exclusive and sectarian in their character (if these epithets apply) than they are at the present time.

We have already recorded our opinion on this subject,* which it would be useless to repeat; but if the system of direct interference with existing schools were carried into operation, certain we are that the different religious societies from which those institutions have originated, would give up all except the directly religious part of the work they have in hand. If, for instance, a general plan of intellectual instruction were enforced under government control, (accompanied though it might be by the reading of the Bible,) the National Society, which is maintained solely and exclusively as the organ and agent of the Church, must confine its operations, and the assistance it gives, to Sunday-schools; those grants which have hitherto been freely expended in aid of the general cause, and in multiplying the school-rooms, with which the face of the country is becoming thickly studded, must henceforward be exclusively appropriated to the encouraging and securing, by various methods, of the particular instructions which are connected with the doctrines and discipline of the established Church upon the Lord's day. And in various other ways would evils of a like or worse character be introduced, and the well-organized system which is now at work be disturbed or possibly destroyed.

It remains only to state the methods by any or all of which education might be improved and its advancement accelerated, by a simple extension of a plan which has been tried with great success at a comparatively moderate expense, and without any of those risks which are inseparable from the specious theories of the day. In every case voluntary subscription and expenditure of local means might be required as indispensable for obtaining the public money.

1. *The present system of parliamentary grants may be extended, upon a more reasonable and equitable plan, due attention being paid to large towns, and to the outlay of the local promoters upon the work to be assisted.*

The system now pursued by the Treasury is fair to all parties, inasmuch as all applications, whether from British or National schools, are disposed of on equal terms, according to the time when they are received. But it is unequal and injudicious, inasmuch as £1 for every two scholars to be accommodated in the school-rooms, is the maximum given in any case. Thus a school built by the side of a stone quarry, on a piece of the waste land, where labour is the principal expense, obtains assistance at the same rate as a school in the centre of Manchester, the site of which alone may cost £1000 or £1500, and where expensive materials must be bought and carried to the spot. The reply at the Treasury to this remark would probably be of this kind—'Very true, it

* July, 1835, No. XXXV. Art. IX. pp. 193 and 207.

is hard in theory, but in practice we find that almost all our offers of grants are accepted, and the school-rooms are built.' This is correct, we believe; but then it is equally true that only one school-room is built in a town where six or eight or more school-rooms are required. The local promoters can build one school-room with such assistance as has been given, but their resources are then exhausted, and they cannot proceed with the work of building as the wants of the population require. We trust that the committee on education in large towns, which is now sitting, will have an eye to this statement.

2. *A considerable extension of the plan now in operation may be made with a view to a higher kind of self-supporting school for the children of those who are above the working classes.*

It is true that, as matters now stand, there is nothing to prevent the two education societies from recommending such schools to participate in the present grants. But there are many reasons why the promoters of such institutions might not choose to identify themselves with societies of a charitable description. And it would undoubtedly give a considerable stimulus to the forming of such a new and useful kind of school, if a separate grant (say £10,000 only at first) were set apart especially for the service. There would be little difficulty, we presume, with the Treasury, in accepting certificates or reports from King's College and University College, showing that the applications were such as deserved to be entertained. The institutions to be so assisted must, of course, be limited as to the charges they were allowed to fix for instruction, and other necessary provisions made in order to secure their benefits to the class of persons for whom they were designed.

3. *A very beneficial mode of extending the present system of grants would be by aiding in the erection of dwelling-houses for the teachers of schools.*

The low amount of salary now given to schoolmasters and mistresses is a chief cause of difficulty in finding proper persons for the office. The addition of a house would be more than equal to an endowment of £5 or £6 a year. There are few things which add so much to the respectability of an office as a comfortable house. Our opinion on this point may be collected from what we stated in July, 1835.* The recommendation for a grant for this object might pass through the same channel as that for the school-room does at present; and the property might be vested for the benefit of the institution in the hands of the same trustees. The recent school-site act provides the requisite powers.

4. *Grants for the improvement or extension, or in aid of founding model or normal schools, have already been voted, and might with advantage be appropriated again exclusively to this object.*

The former grants here referred to were available for schools in Scotland as well as model schools in England. The National Society

* No. XXXV. pp. 197, 198.

applied for the benefit of the grant, but the petition was passed over, and the money appropriated to Scotch schools exclusively;* on what grounds we are not aware. Certain it is, that the National Society has no less than forty model or central schools, any or all of which might easily be improved and placed upon a footing altogether becoming the service for which they are constituted, by the aid of a limited public grant. And other societies, there can be no doubt, would gladly extend the sphere of their operations, and carry similar plans into execution, from which they are only withheld by the want of funds.

The following account of the Glasgow Model School is introduced as a specimen of the kind of institution, some four or five of which ought to be immediately formed under the direction and control of the Church, out of the existing Central training schools:—

“The seminary will consist of infant, juvenile, and commercial schools; a female school of industry, with one class-room to each model-school, and thirteen for training the Normal students; also rector’s-hall, museum, library, and committee-rooms; each of the model-schools to have a play-ground for healthful exercise and moral superintendence. Such an establishment required a much larger space of ground than could easily be procured, except at a most extravagant price, contiguous to a dense population of the working classes. A small field was fixed on,—value 2540*l.*,—and purchased at a moderate price per square yard. The situation is Dundas Vale,—in the immediate vicinity of a large manufacturing population.

“The buildings when completed, including the ground, will cost 9000*l.* At present, however, as government has declined giving any answer to the applications made, the committee are proceeding with the two great wings, embracing two-thirds of the proposed buildings, at a cost of about 6500*l.*, leaving the rector’s-hall, library, museum, and several other rooms, unprovided. The four model-schools, with seventeen class-rooms, and two teachers’ houses, are embraced in the two wings.

“In these buildings there will be accommodation for the daily training of one hundred teachers and above one thousand children, with every arrangement fitted to render the seminary a complete school-masters’ college for the training of the teachers of youth.

“Besides salaries for the model-school teachers, a music-master, and one or two other masters for the Normal students, a respectable salary must be provided the rector, so that a permanent endowment will be required of at least 700*l.* a year, in addition to the small fees that are expected from the scholars. With the increased accommodation the new buildings afford, the committee will be enabled to carry out the training system to its fullest extent,—a system already so successful, and so calculated morally to elevate the whole mass of the population; for while it embraces the best elementary and scientific instructions, its foundations are, at the same time, laid broad and deep in the Scriptures of

* See National Society’s Report, 1856, Appendix, VIII.

divine truth,—on the principle of our ancient parochial school system.”
—*Glasgow Educational Report*, 1836, p. 22, &c.

5. Grants in aid of prizes upon the examination of a given number of schools, with a salary or fee to inspectors, would be extremely useful at the present time.

The plan we have before our minds is stated in detail in all of the National Society's reports.* The whole process is laid out there. It is very effective in some parts of the country, and would be so in all parts, if there were funds and sufficient prizes offered, nor would the promoters of schools hesitate to subscribe and meet grants offered for such a purpose. Lord Brougham's bill involves the appointment of a number of inspectors far more than would be sufficient to do all the work of this kind which we contemplate. In fact, the clergy, with other helpers, might do it themselves. Their certificates are deemed sufficient for obtaining the payment of the school-room grants; and they are already accustomed to make reports upon which, from time to time, the National Society votes small grants for prizes in the manner here proposed. Suppose that six grants were assigned to each county, three of 5*l.* each, two of 10*l.* each, and one of 20*l.*, to be given away, with some increase from the county education fund, as prizes to the best schools, upon an accurate report of the examination of not less than forty or fifty different schools, after the plan which the National Society has pursued, the report to be certified by that or the British Society (or both, where both schools existed) as satisfactory and correct. The whole expense to the country would be less than 3000*l.* a year; and we are satisfied that the stimulus, trifling as it appears and really is, would suffice, nevertheless, to call forth a degree of exertion on the part of the teachers, (and even of the clergy, who would be kindly disposed to aid those who are their own helpers in the teaching and training of the young,) which would have a highly beneficial effect.

6. The last item we propose is the aiding in the purchase of playgrounds adjoining school-rooms, especially in large towns, for the purposes of healthy exercise to the children, and in order that they may be under some kind of superintendence during the hours of recreation.

It would lead us into matter of inconvenient length to justify the recommendation to this effect. We trust that it may be taken up by the Committee of the House of Commons to which we have referred. But we willingly embrace the opportunity of offering our humble tribute of praise to the exertions and tact of the Educational Committee at Glasgow. They have drawn attention to this subject in a forcible manner. They have suggested many valuable improvements in the system of education which are mainly dependent on the turning of the play-ground to its proper account. They would have it made the means of acquiring a knowledge of the habits and disposition of the

* See Appendix (every year) on District Societies and Examination of Schools.

pupils, when their minds are unbent and their spirits free as air, during the relaxation which follows the school-room occupations. *

If our suggestions on these particulars should gain any attention, we should of course expect that some of the plans proposed would be tried by way of experiment, rather than the whole of them be brought into operation at once, but if all were tried in the course of the next year, the experience which has been gained in the management of the school-room grants justifies us in stating that there need be no additional expense at public offices, on account of the work. It would be performed by the voluntary Societies, as in the case referred to; and the whole of the grants for the six different plans, (including the usual 20,000*l.* for the school-rooms,) need not exceed sixty thousand pounds.

* See Third Report of Glasgow Society, quoted before.

NOTE.—Since the preceding article was written, the Bishop of London has published a sermon preached on behalf of the National Society, in compliance with the Queen's Letter. Those who know his lordship's happy style of exposition, the clearness of diction, and the singleness and unity of purpose for which his sermons are remarkable, will at once form an idea of the value of his testimony at the present moment, grounded and supported throughout by the text, "*Wisdom is a defence, and money is a defence, but the excellency of knowledge is, that wisdom giveth life to them that find it.*" We refer to this publication because we conceive that it affords general and unqualified support to the arguments which it has been our business to set forth. There is a preface to the sermon of much value, in which his lordship renews "the protest he had already made, as a member of the legislature, against all attempts to introduce in this country a system of general education, which excludes, or omits, all direct instruction in the Bible." The protest against the Central Education Society, "which argues for the exclusion of religion from the *regular* intellectual instruction of schools," is repeated, and the charges against that institution are substantiated. His lordship is of opinion, and, we think, proves the point, that "neither the Central Society, nor the government itself, were it disposed to make the attempt, (which he does not believe to be the case,) could succeed in forcing upon the people of this country such an education as the former (Central Society) contemplates." He goes further and says, what we believe to be most true, "that no system of education can be forced upon the people at large, which shall not be in conformity with the principles of the Church of England, and work by its instrumentality. *It will be our own fault if it be otherwise!*" The example of Holland, as favouring, to a certain extent, the views of the Central Education Society, is considered at some length, with other important matters, and we are happy to find that one of the plans we have enumerated (No. 2, p. 372) has his lordship's countenance and is likely to be carried into effect. "I entirely agree (his lordship writes) with Mr. Horner, (the translator of M. Cousin's work on Holland,) in thinking that an effort should be made to establish schools of a better sort; not merely however for the children of the working classes as we commonly understand the expression, but for the class next above them, the little tradesmen and artisans, for whose children a good and useful education, comprising sound religious instruction, might be provided at as small a price as that which they now pay for the worst possible kind of tuition. I have long been desirous of seeing this effort systematically made, and I now rejoice in the certainty of its being made, either by the National Society or by some kindred association acting upon the same principles."

- ART. IV.—1.** *The Study of Morals vindicated and recommended, in a Sermon preached before the University of Oxford, February 5, 1837.* By Henry Arthur Woodgate, B.D. Fellow of St. John's College.
- 2.** *The Law of the Mind and the Law of the Members, a Sermon preached before the University of Oxford on St. Peter's Day, 1837, with Notes and an Appendix. Wherein the Existence of an innate Moral Faculty is maintained, and some Observations are offered on Mr. Woodgate's late Sermon.* By Charles Henry Craufurd, M.A. Rector of Old Swinford, Worcestershire, and Chaplain to the Marquis of Londonderry.
- 3.** *On the Foundations of Morals. Four Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge, November, 1837.* By the Rev. William Whewell, Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College.
- 4.** *The Dangers and Safeguards of Ethical Science, the Inaugural Lecture of the Rev. W. Sewell, M.A. Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Oxford, and Sub-Rector of Exeter College.*
- 5.** *Remarks upon the Aristotelian and Platonic Ethics, as a branch of the Studies pursued in the University of Oxford.* By the Rev. Frederick Oakeley, M.A. Fellow of Balliol College.

GREAT discoveries are not to be expected in moral philosophy. We can never be masters of its propositions as we are of those in mathematics and physics. For its objects are external to our understandings, and have a reality independent of, and co-ordinate with, or anterior to our own. The forms to which we refer material objects, when we are said to explain or understand their relations, are purely intellectual, and comprehended by our intellect. When they are once defined, we possess the means of deducing from them innumerable relations expressed in terms of space and time, and that with a certainty which we cannot question. But it is impossible to define any single object of moral philosophy without introducing some term, whose meaning we do not thus comprehend. Nor can our apprehension of the meaning of such terms be secured from error by mere instruction or attention, as it requires a certain state of the habits and affections, and presupposes acts and feelings.

Hence the existence of manifold errors in moral philosophy is no proof that the subject has not been in the main satisfactorily treated, any more than mistaken notions about the sun, held by Hottentots or Esquimaux, are a proof that the outlines of the

solar system were not correctly drawn by Newton, or filled up by La Place. Indeed it would rather be a phenomenon craving solution, if we saw the Church, the great organ of moral education, so crippled, and so limited in her operations as she is, and yet no growth of false systems arising from the undirected workings of human intellect, invited to high thoughts by her presence, but not duly aided by her guiding hand.

Those fundamental notions, which Mr. Whewell so well describes as being essential to the progress of physical science, are capable of being fixed and defined in terms purely intellectual, and the apprehension of these requires a certain intellectual education and exercise. But those of the science of Man can only be apprehended by Man educated as in his true spiritual state, and in the experience of his true spiritual relations.

Error may indeed often be demolished by the exposure of its inconsistency, but that process is not enough to supply its place with truth. And in such subject-matter as that of morals, the scattered fragments of an erroneous system are apt only to fall back upon a new centre, somewhat more remote than before, and assume again the appearance of a system capable of similar demolition and reconstruction.

Such is eminently the case with Utilitarianism, a system built on the negation of any real centre of our moral perceptions, and supposed proved when they are so ranged round an imaginary centre, that no inconsistency remains in sight. To every one who is not satisfied to build his system on its own baselessness, the primary negation of any absolute good prior to pleasureable sensation, is the one great inconsistency which disproves the whole. But that granted, the parts gravitate no-whither, and admit of endless refinement of adaptation.

But when the main principles of the science are assumed, and the truths of Revelation which exhibit them in life are believed, men are still liable to inaccuracies of thought, and are allured on all sides by systems professing to give the mind a mastery of this science, the notion of which is as flattering to pride as it is repugnant to reason.

The danger of these is obviated partly by the exposure of error, partly by the effects of discipline, partly by the right use of authority, and partly by the striking out of such lines of thought as may exhibit in a true order and coherency those objects which for the time being mainly engross the attention of thinking men.

Bishop Butler's *Analogy and Sermons* are an excellent specimen of this last. The balance of the faculties, and what deter-

mines the nature of the individual mind, was the subject of the problems of his day. And he has shown the relation of those problems, for instance, of the question of liberty and necessity to religion and to moral philosophy, with a clearness most useful to any one who is perplexed in the inquiry. The problems of this day relate more to society and to education, and while the revival of doctrine and practice relating to the Church is necessary to supply the foundation for a right scheme on which they may be solved, a philosophical inquiry into the relations which we bear to the Church is necessary for the superstructure.

Mr. Woodgate's Sermon contains excellent remarks on this subject, though not intended as a full discussion of it. Indeed the limits of a single sermon do not allow of any thing like a complete statement of what ought to be said on the points of which he has treated, much less on those which he has touched upon. Besides, it is very difficult to enter thoroughly into the exact meaning which an author attaches to each term, when so little is set before us at once. For although it would be annihilating not only science but reason, to suppose that there is no such thing as *the right* nomenclature in moral philosophy, and that therefore every writer may make one for himself, or all may acquiesce in one that is arbitrary; yet it would be too much to expect any one man to have full possession of the correct use of words.

Two men, who hold the very same opinions, might yet dispute, for instance, whether Christianity introduces new motives. And that even after the common confusion of thought on this point, the identifying of the motive with the object, has been corrected.

No affection is a motive, till it has an object. Nor indeed can it properly be said to exist till then. We should rather say that the capacity for it, or tendency toward it, exists, and that this, meeting the object, gives rise to the affection. But for this capacity and tendency we want acknowledged terms, as they are generally denoted incorrectly by the name of affection. In one stage of inquiry this inaccuracy may be of small moment, but now it is far otherwise. Now since the tendency is not a motive till it has an object, or, to speak more correctly, does not produce a motive affection till it has an object; it is evident that two different objects may be said to give rise to two different motives, in that the affections are different, or to one only, because the tendency, on which they act, is the same. Again it may be argued that the same tendency is called into action only by the same property in different objects, and that therefore it may be said to give rise to but one affection. And to this it may be replied, that the af-

fection is not towards a mere property, but towards a Being possessed of that property; and farther, that in practice our affections are complex, relating to several properties. The love of God is not the same affection as the love of a father, but a similar affection resulting from the same capacity as related to a higher object. The capacity is not motive where dormant, and when awakened by distinct objects, it takes distinct forms, which may therefore be called distinct motives.

Christianity then presents new objects to the soul, and may, in that sense, be said to call forth new affections, and to introduce new motives, though it be but by acting on tendencies prepared before by less adequate objects, and though the new objects be presented to it by means of the analogies of the old.

The tendency is always according to some idea, which is not the object, but the ground of the communion of the soul with the object. The soul is capable of being in the idea, and the object either is according to the idea, or is capable of being so, and yet is not so, or is incapable of being so at all. Accordingly, the object is approved, disapproved, or disregarded with respect to that idea.

The term idea is here used, not as by Locke, who professedly confounds it with half a dozen other terms, for a notion, but for something which cannot be of itself an object to the mind. Ideas are those forms of being to which we believe that our forms of thought correspond, in which we conceive of things existing, and the partaking of which constitutes their essence. We cannot think of rectitude as an object, though we discern that things right are according to it. We cannot think of equality as an object, though we know that things equal are according to it, and to be according to it is that which constitutes them what they are, equals.

The notion that the desire of right-acting cannot be a motive, arises from some confusion of thought on this subject. It is not the mere name that we desire, but the thing. The tendency toward it is no motive till we have a case before us, but then it is a motive. And though all that is requisite to make an act accord with the idea of rectitude be not at once present to the mind, yet the Stoic may remember that to do this and that is according to right reason in himself, and so be affected by a partial view of its accordancy with the idea of rectitude.

The plain moral man may refer an action to the standard of rectitude in his own mind, as a child would refer two eggs to his undefined standard of equality or similarity, and feel its accordance. In both these cases, however, the idea cannot be realized

without reference to a supposed superior being, unknown, but whose relation to us is such as to carry with it an overwhelming weight in all questions of right and wrong. Hence, while that being is not truly known, innumerable prejudices hold the place due to right views of things as referred to him.

In like manner the Christian may remember that the like action is according to the relations of things to God, and therefore according to the Divine Wisdom, and so be affected by a view of its accordance with the idea of rectitude, more extensive than he can comprehend. For to man there can be no definition of rectitude really higher than "according to God;" the idea of rectitude being in the Divine Wisdom simple and perfect, together with all other ideas. So that even in the acts of God we can form no higher conception of rectitude than that of accordance with His essential Wisdom. To us, then, it is right to act according to God, and, since His will is according to all His attributes, it is right to act according to His will: which is itself a ground of action capable of supplying a real motive, because we are capable of a real affection in respect of it.

Indeed, what has just been said of the idea, into which the mind enters, must be taken rather as the intellectual theory of what is most perceptibly developed in feeling. It is common now to say that such feeling is the mere result of agreeable and disagreeable impressions of external things. But were it so, it would not stand the tests which are sometimes applied to it. Strong agreeable or disagreeable impressions overcome the mere educational preference of one line of action to another, which results from such causes. But there is no power on earth that can shake the resolution, or change the moral tastes, of a mind used to hold free communion with truly eternal thoughts;—not the metaphysical speculator, who tries in vain to reduce them to palpable forms; but the man who has ever given scope to his feelings in relation to God, and to immortal beings, and fixed them by repeated acts.

A few lines from Mr. Sewell's Inaugural Lecture will best serve to enunciate two important principles, which lie at the foundations of the theory of moral action.

"It is a general law, (which it would be well to bring clearly into light; for its neglect would seem to be the cause of nearly all the mischief now working around us in this age,) that the only objects which can serve as the medium of generating moral power in the human mind are moral beings, and then only when they are contemplated in relation to us, and we to them.

"I will endeavour to state the truth more clearly.

“ Every one will allow that we never exert a real control over ourselves—act from internal principles opposed to passive impressions—rise up to the majesty of beings independent of outward influences—in one word, possess or exercise power, except when we follow a duty against an inclination. There is indeed a time when the struggle often repeated is rendered easier and lighter, and virtue at last becomes almost mechanical. But even then it retains the dignity of moral agency from the power previously exerted. All previous action without a struggle is but submission to impression—a passive movement, lifeless as the floating of a boat down a stream, or the whirling of a leaf in the wind.

“ But it is also clear that no duty can exist except towards persons. No object in the world binds us, ties us down by a sense of paramount imperative right to one course of action more than another, except mental beings like ourselves, possessed of that internal self-acting power, that *ἀρχὴ πράξεως*, which constitutes personality. God seems to have placed moral beings under a system of mutual gravitation, attraction, and influence, just as he governs the heavenly bodies. Mind acts upon mind, and person impels person. Neither the winds of heaven, nor the earthquake, nor the volcano, seem to affect for a moment the rolling on of the earth in its orbit. But let a comet cross its path, or the sun drop from its centre, or even a distant planet suspend its course, and the earth would feel the shock. And so as we advance into a higher and more ethereal region of spiritual existence, material objects cease wholly to affect us ; and at no time, even when our feelings are most deeply immersed in the body, do they affect us with a sense of duty, so that a stone, or a plant, or even an inferior animal, should claim over us a single right, or call up an active exertion. All sense of duty of whatever kind is ultimately resolvable into the perception of those relations in which we stand to other beings like ourselves, and into the acknowledgment of certain feelings—and as naturally flowing from such feelings—of certain actions attached to those relations by God in the primary eternal constitution of our nature.”—pp. 15—17.

It can be only by a regard to things independent of time and accident, that our views of good and evil can be made independent of time and accident. The hope of an indefinite reward, of a reward consisting in the complete realizing of those very relations, on which we are called to act against the impulses of mere sense and passion, is the nearest thing to that perfect and clear perception of those relations, which makes the agent superior to every thing that is not eternal. But this reward, so far as it is matter of hope, is necessarily not clearly understood. For could we really understand the things of heaven, we were already in possession of them.

Mr. Woodgate has insisted much on this, viz. that the true reward of good moral action, the only reward to which we can look, without lessening the purity of that action, is one which persons

in a low moral state cannot understand. He has shown that this truth was detected by heathen philosophers, and is seen no less in the Christian system.

“ Then for sanctions and rewards, ethics promises happiness as a result of right action. Yet it gives not the most remote intimation of what that happiness consists in, and implies, that to do so were impossible. Still it does promise it ; and while promising, forbids, by implication, its being sought *as a motive*, except through faith, as it were, in the means which lead to it, and in the promise that it shall so be ; showing, from analogy, that it will follow on right action, *if done because* it is right ; but that, if sought on its own account, and not through moral principle, it must of necessity fail, not only of being obtained, but of being understood.”—*Woodgate*, p. 12.

“ The time would not allow us now to enter at any length on the second great principle in morals, which is briefly this :—That, as regards the sanctions and the rewards which ethics holds out to its followers, no account whatever can be given of them ; they are only to be sought through faith in the means which ethics prescribes for the attainment of them ; that if thus sought, they will as surely be obtained, as they will be surely lost, if sought in any other way. We learn from the science, that if we act on principle, the internal happiness which is its reward will follow, (as is satisfactorily shown by Aristotle from analogical reasoning,) assuming the conditions to be fulfilled ; but that if sought on its own account, and not through right action, it must assuredly be missed, because each person must form his ideas of happiness and pleasure, from the constitution of his own mind at the time, and from what, at that time, he would most like to possess. So that none but one who was *already* a good man, would form at all a correct notion of it ; while to every one else, a description of it, if it could be given, would be distasteful and repulsive.

“ Of this important moral fact, there seem to be two causes : first, the *immediate* one, arising out of the nature of the case, by which none but a good man could form an idea of, nor be attracted by, what would make a good man happy. Second, the *final* cause,—to the intent that we should act from the purest motives under the supremacy of conscience, not from the mere hope of reward ; the reward not being allowed to possess attractions, save to those prepared for it by a course of previous action, in obedience to the moral sense and the supremacy of conscience.

“ I will not now dwell on the adoption of this important principle into the Gospel, as shown in the *undefined* nature of its blessings and rewards, coupled with the reiterated promise, that they will assuredly be found by those who have first served their Lord from ‘ the faith which worketh by love.’ The investigation of this principle, as adopted into the Gospel, is a noble subject of contemplation, and one well worthy the attention of the Christian philosopher and student. We must now waive it ; but let us mark it, in reference to the utilitarian spirit of the

age. 'Cui bono' is the standard to which every thing, however sacred, is to be referred ; but it is following a shadow ; it is 'sowing the wind, and reaping the whirlwind.' Reason tells us, through the science of morals, and what is really good and desirable, will never be obtained, nay, not perceived or known, unless first sought, because it is *right*. Reason and philosophy confirm to us the truth of the Scripture declaration, that 'godliness is great gain.' But reason and philosophy also tell us, apart from the logical force of the terms, that the proposition will not bear conversion, save to a Christian.

"With thus far advocating this important principle, the time warns us that, much as remains to be said for rendering to it, and the science generally, the justice it demands, the present consideration of it must be brought to a conclusion. Let it merely be added, as a summary, that, whether by the light of reason or that of revelation, while its own reward is annexed to the full obedience to that light, it is to those only who seek that reward, not for its own sake, but through the medium of duty, and obedience to the light within them. Moralists may dispute, if they will, whether the real or apparent good be the object of man's search. The problem ever was, to identify interest with duty. That problem was solved by the direction of the philosophic Stagirite, to seek first our duty in obedience to the purest light we could attain to ; and that, so acting, that light would, far more effectually than any other, conduct us to the possession of our best interests, and surest happiness. That same precept is sanctioned and adopted by the Eternal Son of God, in his injunction, and the analogous promise annexed, when he declares, 'If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me. For whosoever will save his life, shall lose it ; but whosoever will lose his life for my sake, the same shall save it.' And still more in the simple injunction, and the promise which accompanies it ; 'Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things,'—whether the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them, or that which supersedes and eclipses them, in the possession of peace with God through Christ, the consolation of the Holy Spirit, and the hope of future glory—in whatever form it may please Him to realise the promise,—the promise will be realised, that 'all these things shall be added to you.'"—*Ibid.* pp. 30—33.

To this and similar statements, Mr. Craufurd has thought it necessary to object. And it is indeed a pity that he has encumbered his sermon (which, with its appendix of authorities, is a valuable popular work on the faculty of discerning right and wrong in actions, when we know what they are) with this controversy ; particularly as even the rule of the Church prohibits making the pulpit an arena for dispute. It is indeed in a note, but would have been better omitted altogether. The terms in which he gives an account of the reward, with a view to which a person may begin a course of reformation, are in fact such as a person in that state could but most imperfectly comprehend.

Nor would Christianity itself give an adequate account of his release, but by ascribing it to a Divine Power.

He professes to agree so far as to consider that "moral obligation has nothing whatever to do with the hope of reward, or the fear of punishment;" and yet says that "though the *reason why we are bound* to pursue right conduct, is simply *because it is right*; yet our only *motive* to do so, is the *happiness* which is thus to be obtained." He afterwards says the "desire of happiness," but it is a pity that he has not kept the same accuracy of expression every where. This deficiency helps to conceal both from himself and his readers, the fact, that he is saying nothing intelligible. For indeed he is separating what he urges every one to keep united, happiness and rectitude. The desire of happiness must be actually merged in the desire of rectitude before we can do an action as being right; just as it is in the desire of pleasure before we do an action because it is pleasant. Had we not an immediate affection toward rectitude, capable in itself of being a motive, and able to move us by itself whenever our eye is fixed *singly* on the object of it, the desire of happiness would have no real *state of acting upon rectitude* for its object. And so with all other affections, the desire of happiness has no distinct subsistence after the mind is fixed on the object. The reflection, "How happy am I!" is an uneasy one, and leads us always to aim at a higher happiness, and is the very imperfection of our earthly joy. That is most complete in which self is forgotten, or contemplated but as a casual object.

When we fix our eyes on material objects, no doubt, the contemplation of a rational soul may add dignity to the scene; but when the soul is occupied with the view of heavenly and eternal things, the single self is but a homogeneous particle in the ocean, and is barely, if at all, observed. It is like a string, whose vibrations are rendered more intense and continuous by the surrounding harmony of a chorus, but whose note is less perceived than if it were out of tune.

Self-congratulation were the emptiest of all feelings, if not grounded on something better than itself. And yet, were that complete, we can hardly conceive that there would be much room left for its entertainment. Much less should we have occasion for a calculating exercise of self-love, which looks about for some yet unknown happiness, when it is not kept satisfied by the possession of present good. Our affections are unmeaning, and have no objects at all, unless happiness arises from their having their objects, according to Bishop Butler's statement. To say that the happiness itself is the object, is to say that there is no object at all. The chief office of self-love, or the general desire of hap-

piness, is to act when the mind is unoccupied, and to determine it on attending to this or that impulse. It rejects that which does not promise to occupy and satisfy the soul, or that which is marked with some sign of danger. Self-love must be called in when rectitude is introduced to the notice of a mind unaccustomed to attend to it, and must act so far as to reject whatever would prevent a fair hearing of its claim. And this can be effected by indefinite promises and threats, if believed. Their use is, by extending our views beyond the limits of time to which we have usually confined them, to make us cognizant of things independent of time. In this way those terms, which are commonly applied to earthly things, under the notion that they are really good, are used in the language of inspiration to express things heavenly, from our capacity of possessing which they draw their origin.

But since rectitude is a good wholly independent of time, and is essential to our communion with the supreme and eternal good, we can evidently apprehend but an infinitesimal part of its reality, so long as we are in the habit of contemplating chiefly temporal objects. It is for this reason that we cannot understand the happiness of acting rightly; we see rectitude but in a partial and inadequate way, and our affection towards it has not its complete object. But Mr. Woodgate has nowhere said, what Mr. Craufurd imputes to him, that *no foretaste* of the happiness of acting rightly can be expected at present. Only he thinks it wiser to take high ground at once, and to call on the unhappy votary of pleasure or ambition not to wait and argue over the balance of satisfactions in different ways of acting on his present notions, but to believe those who know true happiness, and to obey the call of conscience at once. It is thus only that he can obtain the full advantage of having about him persons in a state of communion with heaven. Whatever may be said, in condescension to his infirmity, to disprove his vain opinion, if he has it, of the balance of enjoyment in favour of vice, must be only subservient to the exhibition of the truth that he was made for communion with higher objects than he can at present apprehend, and that in the knowledge of them alone he can find his true life. In the mean time no *satisfactory* account of these things can be given, for the experience of right action, as such, is as necessary to awaken us to the idea of rectitude, as is the sight and feeling of objects, to make us conscious of space. Mr. Craufurd shows, indeed, that *some* account can be given of them.

“Escape from the misery of vice,” and “enjoyment of the happiness of virtue,” are expressions that mean different things to different men; and they have the least meaning to those, who most need the “escape.” The perception they have of duty is

much clearer and more certain than their perception of the pleasantness of it. The pleasure comes after the choice, and the same affection, which is the ground of the choice, is the ground of the pleasure too. One who turns from a course of sin chooses a course of duty, a course of right acting which he hopes to continue without end, but without knowing *how* it is to be pleasant to him. Its rectitude is unquestionable, and results inevitably from his relations to God, and to His spiritual creatures. And that it is good in itself, and for him as a rational being, is most evident. But the enjoyment of it belongs but little to its lower degrees; though every step is recompensed with a satisfaction that ought to outweigh all that vice can offer, because it is of a higher order. But this comparison, or rather impossibility of comparison, is not so familiar to one, whose senses are not exercised to discern good and evil, but that he often dreams of some wrong course as that of pleasure. Are we to say that he never does this without again declining into it? Is it not a direct apprehension of the Divine Majesty which he would offend, or the Divine Love which he would outrage, that restrains him, rather than any reflection upon immediate or consequent pleasure or pain? If our affections do not rest in their objects as their ends, but in a pleasure or pain connected with them, they have no objects at all. It may be true of sensual inclinations, because in them, indeed, our affections, the actings of our rational souls, have no real objects. But of our higher and spiritual affections it is false; they are founded on real relations, as being real.

The word "happiness" may, indeed, be used in a sense higher than that of pleasure, viz. for the possession of real good. But even in this view, it is not the possession on which we reflect, but the good which we contemplate, that is the ground of our affection. For a spiritual being has no need to seek for relations to anything that is; whatever is, is to him; whatever is good, is good to him. No saying of Aristotle gives us so high a notion of his attainments as this, "That a good man is a good to another good man, as he is to himself." To have conceived such a thought is immortal honour to a heathen. To realize it thoroughly is far from being the first step in the Christian life. It is only after repeated exercise and experience that such truths can be drawn out and reflected on, though, no doubt, they are felt from the first in some degree.

Of course, it will be objected, that such views of absolute good and rectitude carry us into a world of abstractions, out of the line of common feelings, and common duties. But this objection only arises from the necessity of sometimes calling common things by uncommon names in philosophical inquiries.

We are surrounded by *men*. And if we learn to regard them as being what they really are, we shall have no occasion to search for feelings more refined, or relations more obligatory, than those which we bear to them. For they, as we, are not mere isolated individuals, but “members in particular” of one Body, comprehending ourselves, and forming what may be called a Person, to whom we owe more than our utmost efforts can pay, one, whose outward acts we can see, one, whom our outward acts can affect, and yet, one who has a mysterious relation to the Deity.

The steps by which we rise to the contemplation of this Person, and the use of all in adapting us to the highest state of which we can form a conception, are admirably illustrated by Mr. Sewell; a few words must be quoted from a long and most eloquent passage on this subject.

“But it is not so obvious—it seems in the present day to be almost forgotten—that there are two descriptions of persons, each possessing a right over our actions, each imperatively requiring from us the due fulfilment of those relations in which nature and God have placed us to them.

“There are individual persons—and there are persons made up of societies. Any body of men speaking by one voice, and acting as a community, is as capable, in the eye of a moralist, of possessing moral rights, and of claiming moral duties, as it is in the eyes of the jurist of inheriting property, or of exercising a trust. It may stand to us in relations as clearly seen, and as strictly binding as any individual.

“The relation of brotherhood, consanguinity, beneficence, instruction, protection, even something more than a moral parentage, may all be enjoyed and fulfilled by bodies of men just as they are by us separately.”
—p. 38.

“And the deduction which I would draw is this; and if we do find ourselves placed in connection with any body, exercising to us the duties of the closest and tenderest and noblest relation of human nature—if on it depend the right fulfilment of all other relations of social life—if the moral authority of this body, attested by all the acknowledged evidences of mental greatness, is superior to that of any other society, and, much more, to that of any individual upon earth, then our duty to that body is paramount to all other earthly duties, and all our speculations, like all our actions, should be placed under its control, and subordinated to the furtherance of its views.”—p. 41.

It is truly gratifying to see the coincidence of this, in direction at least, with the somewhat different, but parallel line of Mr. Woodgate's inquiry. And another work has lately appeared, which promises that Cambridge will do her part in prosecuting the same great plan of investigation. Mr. Whewell's *Four Sermons on the Foundations of Morals*, are a valuable testimony

to the same great truths which are insisted on by the other writers of whom we have spoken. And he, as well as they, may contribute, we might say has contributed, towards the formation of a consistent and received body of moral philosophy, deduced from sound principles. His proposed edition of a part of Butler's works, exhibited as a system, may be of use to many minds, particularly to those who are not familiar with the systematic treatise of Aristotle, in which the main principles are the very same which he and his Oxford contemporaries propose to work out. The subjugation of the inferior faculties to the superior,—of the whole man to conscience, *i. e.* to God, is the principle which he assumes as the basis of a system of ethics. And it is this, in one form or other, which has been involved in all systems hitherto, so far as they have been true. And Mr. Oakeley's remarks have shown how well the system of Aristotle will bear adaptation to the acknowledgment of higher relations than he knew, and how he seems tacitly to refer to an unknown God. But it must be remembered, that the one principle just mentioned, will give rise only to general rules, which cannot be applied to particulars without a knowledge of the constitution of things in those mysterious points which connect the material with the spiritual world. The relations to superior, equal, and inferior beings, insisted on by Mr. Sewell, the three "friendships" of Aristotle, which are real spiritual relations, very visibly embodied in many cases, will carry us to a considerable length in this investigation. But the manner in which the New Testament refers to the original constitution of things, as a ground of practice, seems to indicate something, which, in our present state, we shall hardly fathom. Indeed, the very notion of determining questions relating to sensible objects, by a reference to unseen and spiritual relations, implies some scale of interpretation, by which the one may be expressed in terms of the other.

It is common to say, indeed, that all our terms for expressing spiritual things are derived from those which express natural objects; and that all our knowledge of the former is derived from the analogy of the latter. But this is only true in the same sense as it is true that we derive the notion of a cause from experience. Experience would never convey to us the notion of a cause, by the repetition of uniform sequence, whether of external events one on another, or of events external or internal on our volition, had we not an innate tendency to conceive of these things according to the idea of causation. No more would acts of government convey to us the idea of authority (to be obeyed for *conscience* sake), but that we are so constituted as to appre-

hend the spiritual reality of the will of God, conveyed to our understanding by means of subordinate agents.

When, therefore, words, which are commonly used to express physical relations, are applied to higher subjects, it is always with the condition, that the thing understood by them is not the external object or fact, but the spiritual one, which we discern as embodied in it. And as, even in natural philosophy, there must always be a causation apprehended which is beyond the reach of explanation, and ultimate; so, and much more, in moral philosophy, there must always be a mysterious link between the seen and the unseen, which it is the province of faith to maintain. Perhaps it should rather be said, that here the province of philosophy ends; that true philosophy submits to her guide, when once found, implicitly.

Without the Church, or where her presence is not felt, there must ever be a great mass of possible actions, which are, as far as any known principle is concerned, indifferent. These may either be set aside by the killing sternness of stoicism, left undisciplined by an epicurean licentiousness, held in doubt by an academic liberality, or arranged by imaginary principle, or utilitarian calculation.

But within her precincts, if men indeed know where they are, they find few actions that can be called indifferent. This is the case to some extent in every vigorous polity. External acts take their meaning from the manner in which man is accustomed to act upon man, and are approved or disapproved according to the real acts which they denote and convey. But, in that polity which is based on the true constitution of man, which unites him with his real origin, which extends to his eternal state, which is capable of embracing his whole species, and in which alone he can have his true life, the whole range of his faculties and capacities have their due scope and exercise. Fixed on their proper objects, his desires no longer need the constraint of mere law, which was a provisional approximation to the decision of true wisdom, and in a lower state, most needful to his advancement. And this, perhaps, is the reason why philosophy cannot accurately fix the boundaries of law. Law is from above, if true, and draws rather than heaves men upwards. The calculations, or other ground-works that man would supply, are of subsequent invention, law was never derived from them. Human law may be modified by them, but to suppose them the ground of obligation is to deny that there is any such thing as obligation.

And though law is not the principle of life, yet, even under the Gospel, it is the guard and fence of that principle. Acknowledged law gives us notice when we are declining from the right

path, and is useful to us as a check, to which we submit when we find that we are not steadily pursuing it. It has not the rule of our heritage, yet is it of great authority over us, as those who are not yet of full age, nor entered into complete possession.

And we must look rather to the prevalence of good feeling and obedience, grounded on the knowledge of our highest relations, for the attainment of a state in which all actions will take their due place, than to the advancement of philosophical speculation. It is indeed dangerous to affect to find all that is put forth as new in ancient authors; but this is a safer side to err on, than that of making all philosophy and all religion rest on the last novelty, or even supposing that the last discoverer has surpassed all former inquirers. The intellectual triumph of making a discovery is not a thing to which a Christian, who realizes his position, thinks it worth his while to aspire. He values the truth because of itself, or rather because of its relation to the source of all truth, and not as a mere instrument for the display of his own powers. Thus thinking, he can take a dispassionate view of the question of originality, so meanly contested among the philosophers of the world. He is not unwilling to acknowledge that his own views coincide even with those of heathen sages, as far as their field of vision extended. And when he ranges beyond the thoughts of his fellows, in moral philosophy at least, he does not pretend to do more than give a distinct expression for truths which are present to every good man's conscience. A common man's view is like the picture of a landscape in the eye; a philosophical system is the description, and the principal objects are as much in the eye of the beholder as of the describer.

The doctrine of the supremacy of the intellect would at once place the moral philosopher at the head of mankind. Such may not be his place, and yet he must hold a high station if he is to attain any thing like true philosophy. And since all men are to a certain extent moral philosophers, and use language which has its correct meaning only in the mouth of a philosopher, it is most important that this study should be so cultivated, that right notions may prevail with respect to its leading objects. This cannot be unless men's minds are conformed to the ideas of them by other means. But it will also promote the same end if a sufficient sprinkling of men, possessed of a correct nomenclature and accurate theory, are scattered over the face of society.

To effect this is one of the important duties which belong to our Universities, and there is good reason to hope that they will continue to perform this duty with increasing efficiency. The authors whom we have quoted are evidently men well fitted to hold such

a trust in their hands, even in a period of intellectual excitement and activity like the present. They appreciate and adopt with discrimination what has been already done, and points which are touched on in the writings of Aristotle and Plato, as they appear in common life, expand under their hands, and are developed as fertile germs of thought. The sternness of their principles has indeed alarmed a considerate and generally well-judging writer, lest our youth should be led to shrink from so severe an aspect of virtue. But the strength of their character, and the truth and force of their statements, must at least benefit those who are disposed to receive a sound and practical philosophy. As for the profligate, neither philosophy nor religion itself viewed by the mere intellect, can show them anything pleasant *to them* in goodness. And when they do awake, by what means soever it may be, it is not things said about pleasantness or unpleasantness, but the great objects presented to their attention, that will occupy their thoughts and determine their purposes.

The system, which is thriving under the culture of these able and earnest men, is not to be called that of any particular school. It is the common ground of Aristotle and Plato, and cannot be wholly deserted without the admission of some monstrous falsehood. Even Utilitarians, for instance, must assume that we know whether an action is right or wrong, when we know what it is, though they escape into falsehood by the assumption, that to act is to produce pleasure or pain, *and nothing else*. Thus they are able to assert, that since it is right to act so as to produce pleasure, all actions are good or evil according to the pleasure or pain they will produce. What they think of acts relating immediately to God, whether that they are to be measured solely by the pleasure they will produce to the agent, is for themselves to say. It is true that all actions produce pleasure or pain, but that they do nothing else were a bold assertion.

The true philosophy ventures on no such assumptions. Its assertors may sometimes unguardedly utter negations of all that is not comprehended in some individual theory, but they are sure to contradict them when they bear on any important point. And it is better for a man to contradict himself, than to persevere in contradicting the truth. They feel their way among doubts and shadows by their hold on deep and solid truth; and this has ever been the line marked out for men by the divine dispensations. The patriarchs were approved for preferring the scattered glimpses of divine truth to the dictates of temporal calculation, nay, of natural feeling and instinct. The Jews were expected to rest on their belief of the moral attributes of God, and to see His character in the shadows of the law, and to judge between

apparently conflicting duties in a spirit of faith. And the heathen philosophers had to find the grounds of virtue, and the notions of a supreme Being, in things unseen, and little tangible, obscured by fable and the ill practice of the world. And if we have more light, we have more to view by it, and must not pretend to see otherwise than "as by a glass, darkly," when we look at things above us, nor to see clearly on earth by any other light than what is shed on it from them. That in earthly things which we see by heavenly light, is itself heavenly, as the act of the body is the act of the man, and whatever in it is of reason, is seen by reason.

Error will have its day. Eternal truth itself may give life to forms, that die away from it as the body from the soul. But the main elements of sound philosophy are imperishable, and the possession of them will ever be the inheritance of earnest, humble, conscientious inquirers. They have been ever the inheritance of the Church, and they will not fail to be acknowledged where the Church is faithful and vigorous.

It is, perhaps, rather falling back on what we have stated before, but it cannot be much out of place to quote, to this purpose, a few remarks by Mr. Oakeley.

"Strikingly at variance, again, with many views of the present day, is that system of philosophy, which perpetually distinguishes between the good, and the apparent good; between opinion (what *seems* to men) and truth (what is). Plato was, of course, the philosopher who was led, in opposing the sceptical philosophy of his time, to protest with most earnestness against the system which substitutes, for divine and eternal truth, the fluctuating standard of human opinion. But Aristotle, although characteristically (*in contradistinction to Plato*) the philosopher of *experience*, never loses sight of the unchangeable nature of truth, moral as well as intellectual. He admits, indeed, the general opinion of men as an *evidence*, but never bows to it as a *law*. It is always, with him, a *reason for inquiry*; it may amount even to a *ground of presumption*; but it is never more. It is characteristically the standard of *rhetoric*, as contradistinguished from *ethics*; i. e. of the philosophy of *shewy*, rather than *intrinsic*, virtue. If, however, such consent can be proved not *general* only, but *universal*, it amounts to a *testimony* of highest value. There is, again, the *judgment of the best men*. This becomes even a *standard* of ethics; a kind of personification of abstract moral truth. For, what these men think (it must be remembered) is not right, *because they think it*, but rather they think it *because it is right*. Aristotle has, in this instance, admirably distinguished between general opinion, universal consent, authority, and truth, as beyond all. To us, who at once believe in the corruption of the human intellect, and of the human heart, and who enjoy the privilege of an inspired guide, mere general opinion becomes hardly so much as a ground of presumption. Yet we attribute much to the argument from universal consent. On

the other hand, truth and authority are often coincident. Even Aristotle saw, that something more than mere intellect is required towards authority in practical subjects ; and the doctrine of spiritual influence, not merely *inspiring* (in the strict sense of the term) ' holy men of old,' but promised to the Church, and accorded to the prayer of individuals, goes towards approximating, almost even to identity, abstract and embodied truth."—p. 32—34.

His remarks in general give a very just view of the elements of truth, on which the philosophy of Aristotle was founded. There is also a masterly sketch of some of the great problems of the ancient moral philosophy, and of their solution in Christianity, in one of the late pamphlets on the question of subscribing the Articles, entitled "Subscription no Bondage." It is there shown that the ancient philosophy always pointed to a universal polity, as essential to the true life of man, to his being in act what he is in essence. And so far as this was felt, even though not intellectually acknowledged, men acted as not "born for themselves," but as spiritual beings related to spiritual beings. A man who knew enough to state the truth, however vaguely, was heard with wonder and delight, and if it was but a lovely song to the many, there were always those who obeyed the law written in their hearts, and maintained its dictates in outward form wherever they could distinguish them. These were always so far clear that the intellectual activity of Greece could not avoid meeting and acknowledging their leading features, while afterwards have in vain attempted, and will in vain attempt, to reduce them to forms entirely comprehensible. But they may be applied to wider and wider fields of history, to higher and higher relations of life, till the old seems but the picture and type of the new. They may be from time to time examined till the philosopher sees the greatness of the truth contained in them in its extension to man in every state, powerful to the simplest peasant as well as to himself ; and wonders more at the unfolding view of man as related to God, than the humble and plodding student wonders at his own clouded, though dazzling conception, of a transcendent intellect.

On the use of moral philosophy to ourselves Mr. Woodgate has said much, as indeed it is the proper object of his sermon. Amongst other instances of the application of its results, he introduces the following observations, which deserve well to be more fully developed.

"Take next some of the most important principles now questioned and misunderstood, and see how completely their defence is provided by an acquaintance with the science of morals. We may pass by the adaptation of revelation itself to the moral constitution of man. Take

a subject which follows next in importance, and which has not been investigated ; but which is connected, more or less, with all the subjects at issue between us and our assailants—the adaptation of the Church to the moral constitution of man. It is obvious to any casual observer, that all the attacks made upon us and our system, involve the discussion, modified in a greater or less degree, of what may be termed the Catholic principle, as opposed to the rationalistic, self-trusting, free-thinking, spirit of the age. Not to dwell too long, let us assume the chief features of the Catholic or Church principle to be, that to the disciple, things are to be taken first on trust, on the authority of others, with the promise that, in time, he will understand the truth himself, or (which comes in *practice* to the same point,) be *satisfied* with it ; but that, at commencing, a bias or prejudice (let us adopt that much-abused word) is absolutely necessary for the mere perception of truth ; that he must be brought up to think in this particular way, trained to it from infancy, if possible ; that his mind must be prejudiced in favour of doctrines ; and that then, and not before, Scripture is to be put into his hands, in order that, as St. Luke tells his disciple, he may then ‘know the certainty of those things in which he has been instructed.’ This is the leading principle of the Apostolic Church, (as distinguished from its doctrines,) and is embodied in all its institutions and provisions ; in its infant baptism, and the sacred bias implied in the mere notion of regeneration, and the consequent call for early instruction to retain that bias, and the provision made for this, in the catechism, and creeds, and formularies ; further enforced in the exhortation directed to be given to the sponsors.

“Now, how completely does all this accord with the first great principle in the science of morals, alluded to before, by which moral perceptions presuppose an early bias, and the necessity of being brought up so to think and believe. So that, however bigoted the Church principle may be deemed by some ; however they may stigmatize it as calculated to enslave the human mind, it is at least in accordance with the suggestions of human reason, and the principles of the soundest philosophy. It is no more than might have been expected *à priori*, not only on the assumption that the Author of Nature was also the Author of Revelation ; but also on the assumption, that that Author had designed to infuse the healing leaven of that revelation into the mass of human sinfulness, by instruments best adapted to the moral constitution of the recipient.”—p. 24—26.

The superintendence of the Church has been most eloquently and powerfully insisted on, as the great safeguard of the study of moral philosophy, by Mr. Sewell in his Inaugural Lecture. But the Aristotelian side of this important subject still requires the discriminating logic of Mr. Woodgate. It will be his office, to judge by his Bampton Lectures, now in the course of delivery, to mark definite points for the intellect, where other voyagers have touched on and reported of this vast continent of truth. Their sketches and specimens are more than tempting, but they

have scarcely aimed at exactness of description and hydrography. And should any reader, unaccustomed to the schools, fancy them at times to be cold where warmth is due to the interest of the subject, let him remember that he is not always the warmest friend who talks most of friendship and of feelings. The man who does a hard service heartily, with an air of business, and his whole soul for the time seeming to be in his fingers' ends, or who "throws cold water" upon some cherished scheme of folly, has a hidden reserve of friendship which is discerned by the keen observer in its effects. So it is with the writers who have entered on labours of deep research for the benefit of the Church. Even Hooker has been thought cold, because he is calm and busy at his work; and Butler is often set aside as a "mere moralist:" yet it would not be easy to find writers who show a greater degree of real interest in sacred truth. Take, for instance, Butler's Sermon on the Love of God, in which he undertakes the strange task of gravely arguing that it is reasonable to love God, and performs it without one slip of irreverence, or one flaw of sophistry. How can this be? After one reading one might say, "From the clearness of his mind"—but on a second reading the real cause would appear, a deep-seated reverence and love that were fixed on the Great Theme of the discourse, and knew instinctively how to bear themselves in His presence.

But, indeed, as there is nothing colder than sophistry, so there is nothing that more truly shows a man to be interested in any matter, than his setting himself earnestly to work to examine the real reasons and facts relating to it.

Moral science is not recommended as the remedy for human depravity, but as something useful towards the application of the remedy. It might, indeed, be studied on lower grounds, as a part of the system of humanity to which that remedy is applicable. But, like all other things, when healed by the influence of divine truth, it takes a place which is truly its own, and in which it can work for the glory of God and the good of man. As it served before to detect the contradictions which are involved in the existence of a rational creature ignorant of his Creator, a fallen and redeemed creature ignorant of his Redeemer, a creature capable of holiness, but ignorant of his Sanctifier, and in a system whose every part bears undeniable testimony to original and omnipotent goodness, and to the existence of present evil; so, when revelation has supplied the knowledge of man's real constitution and relations, it serves to aid us in apprehending and in working out the restored harmony of creation. Not, indeed, that it was from the first independent of revelation, for the remnants of patriarchal knowledge were necessary to raise mankind

above a mere material life, and to open their minds to the great questions involved in the very names of right and wrong.

The consideration of the various means, adapted to various conditions, by which men are raised step by step towards the direct apprehension of divine things, is most delightful and instructive. It is in the Christian Church that they are seen in their full and combined operation, but the relations of the state, and the yet more universal relations of the family, have each their office in this work.

We shall never be able to possess ourselves of the fields of moral science, and to command the fruits of all the various and successive conquests that have been made in them, while we are surrounded by unrecognized realities. To study the ethical theory of politics, without knowing that there is such a thing as the City of God, is but a vain attempt. What has been written on that subject must raise in the mind a thousand questions, the answers to which can only be found in facts relating to the Church. And the knowledge of those facts, and of their true import, will carry an inquirer safely through a wilderness of notions, in which he would be utterly lost without it. He will have a centre to which his whole system can be referred, a practical bearing for every result, as well as a guide in every difficulty.

ART. V.—1. *Connection of Sacred and Profane History, from the Death of Joshua to the Decline of the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah.* (Intended to complete the Works of Shuckford and Prideaux.) By the Rev. Michael Russell, D.D. Vol. III. 8vo. 1837. London: Rivingtons.

2. *Histoire des Juifs dans le Moyen Age.* (Depping.) Paris: Treuttel et Wurtz. 1 vol. 8vo. 1833.

THERE *did* exist a period when what was called “The Philosophy of History” substituted a lively and playful scepticism, and a spirited and agreeable trifling, for the study and critical examination of facts. It treated as mere fables the antiquities of Asia. It turned into ridicule the pomp of Babylon, the grandeur of Nineveh, and the riches of Susa, and set them aside as stories unworthy of belief, or even of attention. It altogether discarded the Bible and Herodotus; and, withdrawing Egypt and Asia from the calendar of the human race, reduced what it condescended to preserve of history, to a mere gallery of pictures, or a succession of spirited epigrams.

But, at the very time when the disciples of Voltaire—(in imitation of the high-priest of their school, who, in his ignorance concerning the theory of the earth, had launched out his sarcasms against those learned scholars whose ardour in the dawning science of geology had led them to explore the tops of mountains in search of shells,)—at the very time, we repeat it, when this jeering and sceptical school was making a mockery of science and a sport of history, wise men and travellers, thirsting for information, and full of perseverance and good faith, were advancing by different paths to the investigation of the truths of antiquity, and were laying the foundation of that knowledge which was afterwards to lead to greater and more brilliant discoveries. Niebuhr, who had studied in the school of Michaelis, traversed Egypt, Arabia* and Persia, discovered the site of Nineveh, carried his researches to the ruins of Babylon, copied the inscriptions, and made designs from the antiquities of Persepolis. Anquetil Duperron, who had already made himself familiar with the Asiatic languages, published, under the title of *Zend-Avesta*, a collection of the sacred writings of the Parsees, and thus furnished the learned portion of Europe with a key to those mysterious dialects, and ancient forms of religious worship, of which all traces were supposed to have been lost.† Since that era, however, but especially since the commencement of the present century, a multitude of travellers and learned men, following in the steps of their great predecessors, have explored the East, ransacked Asia in all directions, brought to light a large store of valuable materials, and are still daily labouring to elucidate the hieroglyphics and throw light upon the monuments of those countries. We could not enumerate all who have laboured in this department of investigation without incurring the risk of wearying the memory of our readers. Suffice it to say, that the result of this continued research has been to re-establish, in every point of view, the authority of the ancient traditions, and to render the testimony of former ages almost like so many new discoveries. The names of the Pharaohs, found upon the Egyptian monuments by Young, Sylvestre de Sacy, Champollion, and others, have fully confirmed the reputation of Manetho's writings on the chronology of Egypt. The numerous monuments found in Assyria have furnished us with matter which tends to justify, on many points, the much-disputed assertions of Sanchoniatho and Berosus. The Phœnician alphabet is almost entirely made out;

* Description de l'Arabie d'après les Observations faites dans le Pays même, in 4to, Copenhague, 1772 : avec cartes et figs. Voyage en Arabie et d'autres Pays circonvoisins, 1774—1778 : 2 vols. in 4to. : avec cartes et figs. Copenhague.

† The Works of Zoroaster, 3 vols. in 4to.

and there are now only wanting some few monuments (and which may possibly be found amongst the ruins of Carthage*) to complete our information regarding the language and religion of this people. The cuneiform writing, inscribed on the bricks of Babylon, as well as on the rocks of Persepolis, and discovered more recently in Armenia, on the mountains in the vicinity of the town of Van† (a city built by Semiramis), long continued to be objects of perplexity and wonder to antiquaries. They have, however, begun to lose some portion of their mysterious character, since Dr. Grotefend and the learned and unfortunate St. Martin‡ succeeded in deciphering the names of several Persian sovereigns; and we are entitled to hope that owing to the persevering efforts and combined talents of Schulz, Schlegel, Lassen, Bopp, Burnouf, and other erudite men, who, full of zeal and ardour, have followed in the same track, the last veil will be stripped off from this sacred and ancient language, and we shall finally become acquainted with its full scope and import. Who could have foreseen that from the depths of the Etruscan tombs, in the Campagna of Rome, a crowd of revelations would have been brought to light, and the past genius of the ancient world be exhibited to our view?

By these monuments we learn that the civilization of Etruria, of Greece, and of Upper Asia, were connected together by a similarity of religious forms and observances, of which the graphic representations are the symbols; and these precious relics themselves confirm the venerable traditions of antiquity.

The human race, in its regular and majestic course, has gradually unfolded its powers, and at each successive period of its advance has added to its stores the ideas and information derived from the labours of preceding generations. At every stage of its progress, and from every quarter, it has availed itself of the discoveries of by-gone ages. Thus, in the ancient territory of the east, Egypt, India, Chaldea, Phœnicia, and Persia, have more or less been influenced by one another, each according to its capacity, its resources and its genius; and from similar causes the same influences have extended themselves over Asia, Greece, Etruria, and Rome, according as time and circumstances, and the state of manners and languages, have been more or less favourable. Our efforts therefore should be directed to concentrate

* "*Recherches sur l'Emplacement de Carthage*," by C. T. Falbe, Consul-General of Denmark. Paris. Imprimerie Royale.

† The late Dr. Schulz discovered, in 1827, in the environs of Van, forty-two inscriptions in cuneiform characters, containing indubitable monuments of high Assyrian antiquity, which have been carefully published by the Asiatic Society at Paris.

‡ "*Mémoires sur l'Arménie*," tom. i. p. 13, et suivantes.

into one focus the labours of the preceding races of mankind, as far as our present knowledge will admit, by combining science with tradition; and this is the goal to which, by a simultaneous effort, all our studies should tend, in geology, archæology, philology, numismatics, &c. Thus also, historical truth, so lightly treated by the false and frivolous philosophy of the last century, will become more and more settled and consolidated upon the sound basis of literature and scientific research. In the first place, we have the Bible, which, independently of its sacred character, contains the most magnificent collection of original records ever possessed by any nation from its commencement until the period of its dismemberment and final dispersion. The Bible has again become for us what it should never have ceased to have been—the records where there is the most to study, and in which we shall find every day more and more to learn, in proportion as we acquire fresh knowledge from other sources. It is to the Bible that we must look, as to the highest source of historical facts and the *ultima ratio* of all our reasonings. The book of Genesis gives us a description of the creation, upon which God himself has set his seal. Cuvier, the two Herschels, Sacy, Buckland, Ampère, Greenough, and Humboldt have sufficiently proved by their deep researches the accordance of science with faith, respecting the original formation and the component parts of the universe. Is not the world's age engraven on the barks of trees, in the bowels of the earth, and in the planetary system, as well as written in the customs and traditions of mankind? Observe how, in the first chapter of the sacred book, all the natural sciences are developed in their order and progress. The unformed materials rise out of chaos; a vegetable life is bestowed upon herbs and plants; animals breathe and move; man lives and reasons. Thus the work of God is continually advancing throughout creation, and vitality flows with greater intensity in proportion as it approaches mankind.

Cosmography and anthropology are the pivots on which natural history revolves. The origin of the different races of men, their dispersion after the Deluge, and the statistical account of their migrations, perfectly accord with the most probable deductions to be derived from the biblical tradition. The Hebrew books contain a fund of materials, of which, in our opinion, history has not as yet fully availed itself. The books of the prophets abound with allusions of the highest interest, and with direct testimony, of still greater value, to the antiquities of Upper Asia. Isaiah, Ezekiel, and Jeremiah, and the curious and instructive letter which is to be found at the end of the book of Baruch,

throw important light on the monuments of this cradle of the world. But it is from the book of Daniel that we obtain the most important information. Daniel was himself brought up in the science of the Magi; he resided at Babylon, and died at Susa.

We regret that our limits oblige us to be brief in our introductory remarks; and in order to be economical of the space allotted us, we shall at once proceed in our endeavours to prove, with Dr. Russell, (who has just completed his portion of the series by the publication of the volumes which we have placed at the head of this article,) first, That the Israelites, being more addicted to agriculture and literature,* than to commerce or to the arts of industry, were in these latter occupations inferior to the Phœnicians: secondly, That the dispersion of the Jews throughout the globe has not had the effect ascribed to it by Mons. Depping, of extending everywhere general habits of industry: thirdly, That in consequence of their great maritime trade, the Phœnicians have been, from the most remote period, the principal agents in promoting the civilization of the world: fourthly, That the improvements in the habits and general structure of society take their date only from the Christian era.

The Bible, the two Talmuds, and the writings which have been handed down to us by the Rabbins, plainly demonstrate, by their silence on the subject, that it would be in vain to seek for traces of any species of commerce between the Hebrews and the surrounding nations, before the year of the world 2288, that is to say, before the time of Isaac. Nevertheless, if, contrary to all probability, there did exist, at this early age, any thing that deserved the name of trade, it must have been confined to a traffic in cattle. At any rate it could not be very extended nor very diversified: for otherwise, the records already referred to would have plainly expressed the nature of it, as they have not failed to do in recording the events which signalized the reign of David, at which period the mercantile operations of the Israelites first began to develop and extend themselves.

The Sèfèr of Moses furnishes us with the proof that, prior to their bondage under the Pharaohs, the descendants of Abraham were the importers, and not the manufacturers, of various articles then in use amongst the Asiatics, such as sweet smelling spices, odoriferous powders, worked ivory, &c. The trade in these

* "The Hebrews, it now appears, were amply provided with the means of instruction, both in secular learning and religious knowledge, so far as these precious gifts were vouchsafed to the age of David and his more immediate successors. The seminaries of the Levites diffused around them, in all the tribes where they were established, the refinement and taste to which the love of letters, of music, and of the kindred arts, never fails to give birth."—*Russell's Connection, &c.* vol. iii. p. 120.

commodities was in a great degree monopolized by the Ishmaelites and the Midianites, who conveyed them, by means of camels, as far as the banks of the Nile, to the country of Misraim, where they met with a ready demand. It will be recollected that it was to Ishmaelitish merchants, coming from Gilead, that Joseph was sold by his brethren. Under the dominion of the kings of Egypt, the Israelites became, by the force of circumstances, thoroughly initiated in the arts of their masters; and if, on this subject, we might be permitted to express an opinion, we should be strongly inclined to say, that it was the Hebrews who, under the superintendence of the Egyptians, raised those stupendous monuments of art which have so justly excited the wonder and admiration of mankind. This opinion is not a new one: it has already been put forth by some writers, but has been as strenuously denied by others. But though it is easy to discredit the authorities which give countenance to the assertion, it is not equally so to produce satisfactory evidence of its being erroneous. The only method in matters of doubt is to persevere in the investigation of facts, and to conduct our inquiries with caution, calmness and impartiality, and with a constant reference to historical traditions. Herodotus, and after him Buxtorff, Simon, and Anquetil affirm that in the building of the three great pyramids 360,000 workmen were employed during a period of twenty years, and that the expense incurred for their support amounted to more than ten millions of francs in garlick, radishes, and onions. 360,000 men constantly occupied during twenty years! What would have been the fate of agriculture, if the Egyptians had expended their own energies in such an employment? The workmen were evidently strangers and captives; beings reduced to slavery, whom it was important to keep constantly employed, in order to prevent them from forming projects of freedom and independence. Nothing is more probable than that the construction of the pyramids was undertaken as a measure of policy. We are aware that the Egyptians, as well as the Syrians, Phœnicians, and Babylonians, crouched beneath the sceptre of their absolute monarchs, and that works which formed a simultaneous occupation for thirty or forty thousand individuals were by no means rare at that period. It is not, however, probable that such poor and coarse food, as that above referred to, would have been provided for the sustenance of men in a state of freedom. With slaves indeed it is otherwise; the bondsman has no rights; and this affords additional evidence of the position we maintain.

When the Czar Peter the Great of Russia first conceived the project of populating the deserts of Ingria and Carelia, and

founded in their solitudes a great and powerful city, from what source did he derive the means of raising up the island of Enigari, clearing the soil, levelling trees, and building the fortress, all which operations required the labour of innumerable hands? The troops of Prince Repnin, the Ingrians, the Carelians, and the people of Novogorod, were unceasingly employed; the governors of the interior received orders to supply thousands of workmen and mechanics; Cossacks, Tartars and Kalmucks, and more especially the Swedish prisoners, were forced to aid in these works undertaken by the Emperor. In the summer of the same year, by order of the Czar, 40,000 men were employed in raising and cutting the stones and wood. A whole nation of artificers, of various tribes and languages, hired at the rate of three copecks (three halfpence) per day, were employed in the digging of dykes and in forming canals. They used neither pick-axe, shovel, nor carriage of any description; but carried, either in bags or in the skirts of their castans, the earth which they had loosened with sticks or with their bare fingers. During the progress of this laborious occupation, they slept in the open air, on a damp soil, in the midst of fogs, and of marshes formed by the rains. A nation which had tasted the blessings of freedom would hardly, we think, have submitted to so cruel and barbarous a treatment. Nevertheless, severe as may have been the labour imposed on the Jews under the dominion of the kings of Egypt, they derived some advantage from their residence in that country. Their unhappy state was not entirely devoid of use to them, as we shall have the opportunity of showing. From the earliest times, as shepherds having no fixed habitation, they were principally occupied in cultivating the soil and in tending their flocks. After they had penetrated into the promised land, and driven the Philistines before them, the latter, being confined to the coasts, were forced, in order to procure sustenance, to become the agents of other nations. Being placed in immediate contact with this active race of people, the Israelites, either in a spirit of rivalry or from some other motive, did not long remain without engaging in foreign traffic. Yet their maritime commerce was not fully established till towards the year of the world 2940 or 2950. We do not think there is any ground for assigning to it a much earlier date. The borders of the sea being principally occupied by the Canaanites,* the tribe of Zebulun was the only one which, from its geographical position, could trade with the Mediterranean; and this agrees with the prophecies of Jacob and of Moses. “*Zebulun shall dwell at the haven of the sea; and he shall*

* Canaanite, in the eastern language, signifies merchant.

*be for an haven of ships; and his border shall be unto Zidon.**
"They shall call the people unto the mountain; there they shall offer sacrifices of righteousness; for they shall suck of the abundance of the seas, and of treasures hid in the sand."†

One of the principal branches of the export trade of the Hebrews consisted of honey made from raisins, or of the syrup extracted from that fruit, called by the same name in Arabic. The territory of Hebron alone furnished Egypt each year with as much as 300 camels could carry. A species of wine, made from honey, is still common in this part of Palestine, and is preferred by many to that which comes from Spain, and obtains a very high price in Egypt, where the wines are very scarce and bad, owing to the inundations of the Nile. It is in all probability this species of honey of which mention is made in Genesis (ch. xliii. v. 11). Bochart, indeed, is of opinion that it is common honey which is there spoken of, and Celsus imagines it to mean the juice of dates; but neither of these suppositions is very probable, as it can hardly be supposed that Jacob sent to Pharaoh an article of such little value as the common produce of the country.‡

The Hebrews likewise possessed several beverages peculiar to themselves, such as the *schéchâr*, a wine or brandy made of dates bruised in water; *mayar*, a species of beer; *schischi*, a liquor distilled from the leaves of hemp, containing a mixture of other ingredients, and which occasioned a species of intoxication similar to that caused by opium; *sikerâh*, also an intoxicating liquor, made of *hyoscyamus*; *fokkah*, another species of the same beverage, and which is very probably the same as the Persian *figââ*, &c. We are inclined to believe that the trade in these liquors was carried on only in the interior, no mention being made of their exportation in the writings of the Rabbins. The prophet Isaiah, who rarely employs circumlocution, plainly informs us that the Ephraimites were the most determined drunkards in all Israel. He thus begins his xxviiith chapter:

"Woe to the crown of pride, to the drunkards of Ephraim, whose glorious beauty is a fading flower, which are on the head of the fat vallies of them that are overcome with wine! The crown of pride, the drunkards of Ephraim, shall be trodden under feet: the priest and the prophet have erred through strong drink; they are swallowed up of wine; they are out of the way through strong drink; they err in vision;§ they stumble in judgment. For all tables are full; there is no place clean."

* Genesis, ch. xlix. v. 13.

† Genesis, ch. xliii. v. 11.

‡ Deuteronomy, ch. xxxiii. v. 19.

§ The Hebrew word for prophecy.

Schêchâr, in particular, has been often celebrated in verse and in prose.*

The Hebrews, besides the syrup of honey, had other beverages, held in high estimation, and wines of exquisite flavour, of which they exported a considerable quantity for the consumption of the Egyptians, the Persians, and even of the Greeks. The city of *Chelbon* was known to the latter under the appellation of *Chelybon*, and the country adjoining under that of *Chalybonitis*. The kings of Persia imported wine from Chelbon in the same manner as they drew wheat from the province of Elis, in Greece. According to Monthon, *Chelbon* is the ancient *Aleppo*, and the *Beroë* of the Macedonians is the *Aleppo* of the present day. The Rabbin Aschi, in his commentaries, asserts that helbon is a sweet wine, produced by boiling. The Hebrews extracted wine in the manner used at present, from dried grapes. Several of the writers of the seventeenth century assert that the use of brandy, properly so called, was well known to them. It is an admitted fact that we derive from the Arabs the art of extracting that liquor, as well as of making spirits of wine; and that the terms alembic and alcohol (of which the first syllable is the article, and might be suppressed,) have been handed down to us from that people. *Yain*, the name given to wine, is a primitive word, which Simonis interprets "fermentation." It was amongst the Jews, and other nations of the east, that wine formed a frequent subject of poetry, especially that of the lighter sort. Wine had various denominations, of which several may be

* A little Hebrew poem, composed in honour of Schêchâr, begins thus:—

"Haschéchâr.

"As the rays of the sun surpass in brilliancy the faint glimmer of the stars of night, so a generous wine surpasses, in its animating influences, all that can relieve the thirst of the sons of Adam. You have seen the recreant tremble at the sound of the trumpet. Observe him! Scarcely has the schêchâr moistened his parched lips, ere he precipitates himself madly into the thickest of the fight: his hand is red with the blood of his enemies, whilst he excites his comrades to follow him.

"Fill, comrades, fill; let sparkling schêchâr, monarch of my soul! inspire the song which celebrates its powers.

"If wine thus elevates him who bows to its sovereignty, it can triumph equally over the infidel who defies it.

"The boldest staggers beneath its potency: tents, intrenchments, battalions, and banners, all appear to reel around him. Now a violent tempest agitates his throbbing breast; now the face of heaven is obscured from his sight; and now a bloody veil appears before his eyes, studded with suns countless as the stars of the firmament.

"Fill, comrades, fill, &c. &c.

"A menace is on his lips; he raises his arm, brandishing his flashing sword; but the weapon escapes from his withering grasp: he himself, subdued by an irresistible power, falls like the lofty fir-tree uprooted by the fury of the wind. Schêchâr has vanquished him! He lies extended at his length! Is it not better to yield to schêchâr than to death?

"Fill, comrades, fill, &c. &c."

signified by the term *alcohol*, and of which one, *thirosch* (new wine), is derived, according to the oriental scholars, from the verb *járasch* (to possess), from the power which it had of taking possession of the faculties of those who drank it. A passage in *Zechariah** would lead one to suppose that occasionally young women indulged in the use of it. “*Corn shall make the young men cheerful, and new wine the maids.*” The other name, *arcis*, means that which has been trodden under foot. Old wine has also a particular designation. The most celebrated districts where it was made are frequently mentioned in the Bible. Solomon has alluded to those of Engedi. The valley of Sharon contained vineyards which were amongst the most celebrated of Judea, and the wine of which was so rich as to require the addition of two-thirds water.

The first indications of maritime commerce which we discover in Scripture, do not reach further back than the reign of David and Solomon. It may, however, be conjectured that previous to this first national attempt, others had been made by private individuals. Solomon caused several vessels to be constructed in the gulf of Egypt, near the Red Sea, at a place bearing the appellation of *Ezion-geber*, the same which was called *Berenice* in the age of Josephus, and which was not very remote from the city of *Eloth*, in the kingdom of Israel.† In this first attempt Hiram, the king of Tyre, afforded the Jewish monarch important assistance, by furnishing him with several experienced pilots, who conducted his officers as far as *Ophir*, from whence they returned with 450 talents of gold.‡ About the same period, says the Jewish author, they brought to Solomon gold, precious stones, and pine wood, the finest ever yet procured, and which was worked into balustrades for the temple and the royal residence, as well as into harps and psalteries, for the Levites to sing hymns. Another fleet appears to have brought from *Ophir* 666 talents of gold. According to Josephus, no account was kept at the time of the silver imported, because the numerous vessels which Solomon had on the sea of Tarshish, and by means of which he sent merchandise of all descriptions to distant nations, brought him back immense quantities of this metal, as well as

* Ch. ix. v. 17.

† Schabbath, folio 77 ; Niddah, folio 19.

‡ The Jewish coins reduced in sterling money are—

	£	s.	d.
1 agorah	0	0	1½
1 drachm	0	0	9
2 drachms made 1 beka or the half shekel	0	1	6
2 bekas made 1 shekel	0	3	0
60 shekels made 1 mina	9	0	0
50 minæ made 1 talent	450	0	0
1 talent of gold	7200	0	0

ivory, amber, Ethiopian slaves, and apes. It took three years to complete these voyages.* The letter of Hiram to the Hebrew king finishes thus:—"When by my subjects I have cut down many and large trees of cypress and cedar wood, I will send them to sea, and will order my subjects to make floats of them, and to sail to what place soever of thy country thou shalt desire, and leave them there, after which thy subjects may carry them to Jerusalem; but do thou take care to procure us corn for this timber, which we stand in need of, because we inhabit an island."†

King Solomon appears to have been well satisfied with the proceedings of the Tyrian prince, and to have given him permission to draw yearly from his kingdom 2000 measures of wheat,‡ 2000 baths of oil, and 2000 baths of wine,§ each of which contained 72 quarts (sextaries). We read in the first book of Kings (chap. v. ver. 13, 15.) that Solomon chose from out of Israel 30,000 skilful men, and that he had 80,000 quarrymen in the mountains. The Hebrews, however, who had acquired under their ancient masters, the Egyptians, the talent of stonecutting, were not so skilful as the Tyrians in shaping and preparing wood, and it is on this account that the Jewish king, when he was occupied in the construction of the Temple, applied to the king of Zidon to supply him with some of his best artificers to aid him in his labours. (1 Kings, chap. v. ver. 6.)

Prior to the time of David, the Jews had already commenced trading voyages, by the Red Sea and the Straits of Bab-el-Mandeb (*Door of the Tears*), to the eastern and western coasts of Africa, and the shores of Arabia, Persia and the Indies. This commerce did not, however, become extensive till after the days of Saul. His great successor, by his conquest of the kingdom of Edom, came into possession of Eloth and Ezion-geber,|| two towns on the Red Sea, admirably situated for the purposes of trade. David appears to have availed himself, with much discernment, of their geographical position, and of the resources which they presented for turning to account the industry of his subjects. His first care, when established on his throne, was to cultivate commercial relations with *Tarshish* and *Ophir*, the position of which latter place is not yet accurately ascertained, notwithstanding the researches of Rosenmuller, Bochart, and the learned Michaelis. After David, Solomon continued this valua-

* Josephus, Antiquities of the Jews, book viii. ch. ii.

† Ibid.

‡ The homer or chomer of wheat is equal to eight bushels.

§ The chomer of oil or wine, or ten baths, is equal to sixty-three imperial gallons, three pints.

|| Ezion-geber, in the Hebrew language, signifies *back-bone*, in consequence of the rocks which were at the entrance of the harbour being like this bone of the human body.

ble branch of commerce. He went in person to Eloth and Ezion-geber,* fortified these two ports, superintended the construction of some of the largest galleys, and took into his service all the sailors he could find. So active were his exertions, that in a very short time he succeeded in drawing to Palestine the entire commerce of Arabia, of Iran, and of the Ind.

To the names of Ophir and of Tarshish, as well as to those of Babylon, Nineveh, Ecbatana, Susa, Persepolis, and Tyre, we involuntarily attach all those ideas of riches, grandeur, and power, which the human mind is capable of contemplating. In Babylon were concentrated the resources and wonders of the vast empire of Assyria, the immensity of which extended its power and dominion over the whole of Asia, and which in its fall has left a vast chasm in the chain of historical records. It is in the immense ruins of this far-famed city, which cover eighteen leagues of territory, and not far distant from modern Bagdad, that are crowded together the only monuments which remain to us of this mighty empire. Nineveh, its rival, has almost entirely disappeared, Ecbatana has scarcely left a vestige of its former grandeur, and the few relics which have come down to us of the territory of Susa, have hitherto presented only enigmas for inquiry and research. Daniel, as we know, lived in Babylon and died at Susa. Among the Greek historians, there are but two deserving of confidence. Herodotus, who visited Babylon about thirty years after Xerxes, and who, being an eye-witness of the greatness of that city, has, as a faithful chronicler, transmitted to us the local and popular traditions which relate to it; and Ctesias, who filled, during a period of seventeen years, the office of physician to Artaxerxes, the elder brother of Cyrus, at the court of the kings of Persia, and who had passed a considerable portion of his time at Babylon, Persepolis, and Ecbatana. The writings of the latter especially are drawn from authentic sources, but unfortunately our acquaintance with them is only from incomplete quotations and extracts, in all probability not very faithfully given. The question as to the localities of Ophir and Tarshish has been agitated not only in our own time, but likewise during the two preceding centuries, and the multitude of researches which have been made respecting it, and the erudition and learning which it has called forth, sufficiently attest the interest attached to the solution of this intricate problem. So long a voyage, undertaken at such a period, and by which not only an almost incredible amount of gold, but likewise a variety of other rare and precious objects, were procured, certainly forms an epoch in commerce and in the march

* See the account of M. Leon de la Borde upon *Petree*, in 1828 and 1829. Paris. 1830.

of the human intellect; and the mystery by which the subject is still surrounded, serves only as a further incentive to our curiosity. There is little doubt but that some valuable information will be elicited, when the eastern coasts of Africa become better known to us, for it is in this quarter chiefly that the science of geography is in its infancy. It appears by the writings of Strabo, that according to some historians, Menelaus had succeeded in effecting a passage over the isthmus of Suez, by means of a canal, formed by the Pharaohs for the junction of the Nile with the Red Sea. We are told that Pharaoh Necho was the author of this great enterprise, and it is added, that after sacrificing in the attempt the lives of 120,000 men, it was altogether abandoned. At the period at which we are writing, undertakings of this description maintain numbers of indigent individuals, but it is very probable, that in an age not remarkable for the practice of humanity, when captives were stimulated to labour by the infliction of the lash, the reverse may have been the case,* notwithstanding which, the fact of so large a sacrifice may very reasonably be doubted. If this canal ever indeed existed, it must have been only *after* its

* May we not contemplate Syria, Egypt, and Arabia, as forming by similarity of race, community and language, the foundation of a new empire?—without taking into the account the fertility of a large portion of the territory, what can be more admirable than its geographic position? It comprehends by its ports a large angle of the Mediterranean, touches on the Indian Ocean from the Straits of Babelmandeb to the Persian Gulf, and as a communication with these two seas, it has on one side the Nile and on the other the Red Sea, forming two great rivers parallel in their course, influenced by the same winds and currents, and the union of which, by means of a railroad or canal, would form a point of commercial enterprise for three quarters of the globe. We behold a country every part of which has been marked by prodigies of power, glory, wisdom, and prosperity, and in which the missions of divine power have left the remembrance of the most wonderful miracles. Here are concentrated, as it were, Thebes, Memphis, the Nile, Mount Sinai, Jerusalem, the River Jordan, Tyre, Sidon, Lebanon and Mecca; it is altogether a region of wonders! And do not our minds become impressed with feelings the most sublime, in contemplating the efforts making at this period, to renovate this interesting country, to raise it, as it were, from its shroud, to enable it to shake off the dust of ages, and to march boldly forward to its regeneration? Already is it prepared, by its example, to bring into prominent activity all those portions of the Mediterranean so renowned in former ages for riches and grandeur, and which formed the brilliant theatre of ancient civilization. Two events were reserved for modern times, as a means of resuscitating Egypt, the placing barriers on the inundations of the Nile, and the forming a communication between the two seas. The Nile, which in former periods could either overflow the Delta or leave it altogether without moisture, will in future serve only as a general and regular irrigator. Hereafter the Nile will be under the control of man, and become an immense reservoir, to be directed by his will; its waves, which, rushing to the Mediterranean, were engulfed in its waters, will be stayed in their course, and accumulate to be poured on the parching desert, which will one day rival the Delta in fertility. By means of the barriers and the works attending them, the Nile will in future give less to the sea, and more to the earth, and expend its abundant waters on the adjacent country, and on the sands of the desert. M. Linant, a French engineer, has the direction of these works; and Mr. Galloway, an English engineer, has undertaken the construction of the iron railroads intended to unite the two seas.

demolition that the Phœnicians and the Hebrews established themselves in the ports of Eloth and Ezion-geber, as, independently of a long journey over a territory which was not under the dominion of the Phœnicians, the port of Ezion-geber was by no means a secure one. The fleet of Jehoshaphat and Ahaziah was cast away on its rocks, and the former of these kings was obliged to fit out a new fleet at Eloth. Jehoram, the son of Jehoshaphat, having been deprived of these two ports by the loss of Idumea, the commerce became interrupted till the reign of Uzziah, who retook Eloth. Rezin, king of Syria, obtained possession of it at the time of Ahaz. While the Tyrians were masters of the commerce of Palestine, they established a depôt at Rhinocorura, between Egypt and Judea, either because a channel of communication existed between this town and the Red Sea, or that merchandize could be transported thence on the backs of camels. The history of the Golden Fleece, in whatever way it may be understood, must lead to the belief that the country of Colchis was extremely rich, which circumstance has induced Dom Calmet, who, it seems, had no great predilection for long voyages, to fix on its locality as the probable site of the celebrated Ophir, called likewise Phaz and Uphaz. We are by this hypothesis left in doubt as to the utility of a port in the Red Sea, since Dom Calmet makes his fleet sail up the Tigris and Euphrates, whilst it might have gone with much more ease from Tyre to the mouth of the Phasis; but as Palmyra (the Tadmor of the Bible) was at no greater distance from the Phasis than 200 leagues, it would have been much easier to have sent caravans than ships. Moreover, until the reign of Mithridates, the northern part of the Euxine was so wholly unknown, that the Palus Meotis was thought to be united with the ocean. In truth, Dom Calmet has done nothing but copy what the old chronicles relate on the subject. Since the heroic ages, the Egyptians, become more timid, had abandoned all maritime commerce with the Indians. Arrian denies that previous to the time of Alexander the voyage from the Arabian to the Persian gulf had ever been undertaken. Eratosthenes maintains that no one had ever advanced more than 1500 stadii beyond the straits of the Red Sea; and lastly, Strabo and Dionysius Periegetes state, that before the time in which they lived scarcely twenty vessels had performed the passage. Most of these authors, with the exception perhaps of Eratosthenes, seem to be unacquainted with the circumnavigation of Ophir and of Tarshish. But the difficulties of their navigation sufficiently account for the length of time occupied in the two voyages. These reasons have induced some orientalists to look for Ophir in Arabia, where Moses mentions a town of that name, but with

throw important light on the monuments of this cradle of the world. But it is from the book of Daniel that we obtain the most important information. Daniel was himself brought up in the science of the Magi; he resided at Babylon, and died at Susa.

We regret that our limits oblige us to be brief in our introductory remarks; and in order to be economical of the space allotted us, we shall at once proceed in our endeavours to prove, with Dr. Russell, (who has just completed his portion of the series by the publication of the volumes which we have placed at the head of this article,) first, That the Israelites, being more addicted to agriculture and literature,* than to commerce or to the arts of industry, were in these latter occupations inferior to the Phœnicians: secondly, That the dispersion of the Jews throughout the globe has not had the effect ascribed to it by Mons. Depping, of extending everywhere general habits of industry: thirdly, That in consequence of their great maritime trade, the Phœnicians have been, from the most remote period, the principal agents in promoting the civilization of the world: fourthly, That the improvements in the habits and general structure of society take their date only from the Christian era.

The Bible, the two Talmuds, and the writings which have been handed down to us by the Rabbins, plainly demonstrate, by their silence on the subject, that it would be in vain to seek for traces of any species of commerce between the Hebrews and the surrounding nations, before the year of the world 2288, that is to say, before the time of Isaac. Nevertheless, if, contrary to all probability, there did exist, at this early age, any thing that deserved the name of trade, it must have been confined to a traffic in cattle. At any rate it could not be very extended nor very diversified: for otherwise, the records already referred to would have plainly expressed the nature of it, as they have not failed to do in recording the events which signalized the reign of David, at which period the mercantile operations of the Israelites first began to develop and extend themselves.

The Sêfèr of Moses furnishes us with the proof that, prior to their bondage under the Pharaohs, the descendants of Abraham were the importers, and not the manufacturers, of various articles then in use amongst the Asiatics, such as sweet smelling spices, odoriferous powders, worked ivory, &c. The trade in these

* "The Hebrews, it now appears, were amply provided with the means of instruction, both in secular learning and religious knowledge, so far as these precious gifts were vouchsafed to the age of David and his more immediate successors. The seminaries of the Levites diffused around them, in all the tribes where they were established, the refinement and taste to which the love of letters, of music, and of the kindred arts, never fails to give birth."—*Russell's Connection, &c.* vol. iii. p. 120.

commodities was in a great degree monopolized by the Ishmaelites and the Midianites, who conveyed them, by means of camels, as far as the banks of the Nile, to the country of Misraim, where they met with a ready demand. It will be recollected that it was to Ishmaelitish merchants, coming from Gilead, that Joseph was sold by his brethren. Under the dominion of the kings of Egypt, the Israelites became, by the force of circumstances, thoroughly initiated in the arts of their masters; and if, on this subject, we might be permitted to express an opinion, we should be strongly inclined to say, that it was the Hebrews who, under the superintendence of the Egyptians, raised those stupendous monuments of art which have so justly excited the wonder and admiration of mankind. This opinion is not a new one: it has already been put forth by some writers, but has been as strenuously denied by others. But though it is easy to discredit the authorities which give countenance to the assertion, it is not equally so to produce satisfactory evidence of its being erroneous. The only method in matters of doubt is to persevere in the investigation of facts, and to conduct our inquiries with caution, calmness and impartiality, and with a constant reference to historical traditions. Herodotus, and after him Buxtorff, Simon, and Anquetil affirm that in the building of the three great pyramids 360,000 workmen were employed during a period of twenty years, and that the expense incurred for their support amounted to more than ten millions of francs in garlick, radishes, and onions. 360,000 men constantly occupied during twenty years! What would have been the fate of agriculture, if the Egyptians had expended their own energies in such an employment? The workmen were evidently strangers and captives; beings reduced to slavery, whom it was important to keep constantly employed, in order to prevent them from forming projects of freedom and independence. Nothing is more probable than that the construction of the pyramids was undertaken as a measure of policy. We are aware that the Egyptians, as well as the Syrians, Phœnicians, and Babylonians, crouched beneath the sceptre of their absolute monarchs, and that works which formed a simultaneous occupation for thirty or forty thousand individuals were by no means rare at that period. It is not, however, probable that such poor and coarse food, as that above referred to, would have been provided for the sustenance of men in a state of freedom. With slaves indeed it is otherwise; the bondsman has no rights; and this affords additional evidence of the position we maintain.

When the Czar Peter the Great of Russia first conceived the project of populating the deserts of Ingria and Carelia, and

under the name of *amyris opobalsamum*, and which still grows in the desert of Medina, was at that period to be found only in the garden of the kings of Judea, which was situated in the province of Jericho, the warmest spot in the country, near Hazazon-Thamar and not far from Engedi. Hence the Arabs frequently denominated Jericho, "The City of Balm."* During the wars of Judea, the Jews wished to destroy this garden, but were prevented by the Romans, and, following the example of Pompey, the Vespasian emperors caused a balsam tree to be borne in their triumphs. This shrub resembled the pine, except that it was shorter in its growth, and according to the above-mentioned authors, it was cultivated in the same manner as the vine. The pastoral and laborious life led by the Israelites, before they sought to enlarge the bounds of their territory, or to destroy whole nations in pursuance of that end, and of the divine commands, is not devoid of interest. They knew that man had been doomed, after his fall, to till the soil, and they felt a conviction of the important truth, so often repeated in the books of Solomon—that "Idleness is the parent of want."† "That he who sleeps in summer, instead of gathering his harvest, and neglects his labour in winter, for fear of the cold, deserves to beg and find no bread."‡ "That plenty is the natural consequence of perseverance and industry."§ "And that a humble lot, with peace of mind, is preferable to great riches."|| And hence, also, in the Book of Proverbs, and indeed throughout the Scriptures, what is denominated labour, business, property, relates almost always to the cultivation of the soil. Fields, meadows, vines, sheep, and oxen, furnish the prophets with the greater part of their metaphors. Princes and chiefs are styled pastors, "their people are their flocks;" to govern is to "let them graze." Thus the Hebrews sought their subsistence only in the most natural of possessions,

* Palestine is, at the present time, very nearly what it was in the time of Moses; dates and grapes ripen together as formerly, in the neighbourhood of Jericho; the date requires a temperature of 21 degrees, the vine 22 at the utmost, as it ceases to flourish in too warm a climate. The medium temperature of Palestine is calculated, therefore, to have been in ancient times between 21 and 22 degrees (Réaumur); the temperature of Jerusalem is, at the present day, computed to be within the same limits. It is not so in France, the general aspect of which has undergone considerable change from the clearing and cultivation of lands; the summers have become, in several provinces, less fervid, and the winters less cold. In the reign of Philip Augustus (12th century) the vine-dressers of Beauvais presented themselves amongst the concourse assembled for the provision of the royal household: at the present day, a vine-gathering at Beauvais is scarcely possible. In the sixteenth century, there existed in the Vivarais productive vines, in spots, where they have now completely ceased to ripen. Old chronicles relate, that in ancient times the vine was cultivated in England, and it is well known, that the Emperor Probus granted to the Britons permission to plant the vine. These changes are produced by human labour, and are not to be attributed to any decrease in the caloric heat of the sun.

† Proverbs, x. 4.

‡ Ibid. v.

§ Ch. xx. 4 and 13.

|| Ch. x. 1.

that is to say, in lands and in cattle, from which two things are derived all that constitutes the riches of mankind. The former state of Palestine must not be judged of by that to which it is at present reduced. From the time of the crusades to the period when it became subject to the Turks, the Holy Land has been the theatre of cruel and perpetual wars, which have destroyed its population, and caused its soil to be uncultivated,—and now, reduced almost to a desert, it presents to the traveller nothing but ruins, wretched villages, and a territory overgrown with weeds, which prove how great must once have been the natural fertility. The Turks, indeed, have neglected it, as they have neglected most even of their own possessions; and numerous tribes of Bedouin Arabs are allowed to roam about and pillage and murder the inhabitants with impunity. In order to form an idea of what Judea formerly was, we must have recourse to the ancient writers, and consult Josephus and our Bible. The gigantic bunch of grapes brought by the spies to Moses, sufficiently proves the Holy Land not to have been a sterile country.

Jerusalem is the ancient parent of other cities, both in the eastern and western world—the great theatre of past events, and though now mute and solitary, is perhaps prophetic of the future by the tokens with which she is now marked.—To see her is to hear her. But let us enter her walls. Here stands the gate of Bethlehem; a few steps from it may be seen a broken and tottering tower, once the tower of David, the poet king, the writer of the Psalms; he, who in the height of glory and of power, sighed forth the Miserere. Further on, in a narrow and ill-paved street, on a rising ground, the foot strikes against a broken capital, which had been placed there to mark the spot where Veronica, a compassionate woman, stood to cast perfumes and flowers on the head of Christ, when fainting under the burden of his cross. The column to which this capital belonged is still standing in an angle between the two gates, and is said to be the same to which the Son of Man was bound, like a criminal to the stake, when he yielded his quivering members to the scourge. We stand then in that sorrowful road, between the summit of Golgotha, where all was accomplished, and the bitter cup of woe was drained to the dregs, and the valley of Jehosaphat, where it is imagined by some the final judgment will be rendered. Let us pass the second gate, where are to be seen a mendicant and a woman in antique drapery, bearing on her head an earthen vessel, resembling that which Rebecca presented to Eleazar, the ambassador of Abraham, when she drew water from the well of Siloam. On the right stands a house which is said to have been that of the luxurious Dives; and the left, that of Lazarus; in front is a gallery from the top

of which were pronounced the words *Ecce Homo*. It stands upon an arcade thrown across the street to serve as a communication from the palace of Pilate to the ancient prisons of Jerusalem, in which Jesus was confined, and which are now only a heap of ruins. The habitation of Pilate is still the residence of the governor of Jerusalem; it has lost only its principal staircase, *la scala sancta*, which was descended by the Redeemer, in his way to the place of crucifixion, and which, transported to Rome in the time of Sextus, was placed in a chapel adjoining St. John of Lateran. From a remote chamber, which must be entered stealthily, in order to elude the vigilance of the janizaries, may be discerned Mount Calvary and the holy sepulchre enclosed within the ruins of a church surmounted by two domes.

What was styled the Temple of Solomon, is now ruined, destroyed, overthrown. The Jews have never been able to restore it since it was prostrated before the cross: but on its imperishable base (within a space which is entered by eight porticoes,) stands the magnificent mosque of Omar, venerated by all Mussulmans. This elegant building, painted in green and gold, surrounded by a white wall, which is pierced at intervals by light and graceful arcades, is one of the most beautiful modern edifices of the East. It leads to the valley of Jehosaphat, where Judaism humbly keeps its place among the tombs. The synagogue is hidden, but the memorials of those Israelites who came from far countries, to take their last rest in the valley of judgment, give irresistible evidence of their undying faith. Jacob still causes his bones to be borne to the land of his fathers!

A little further onwards is the pool of Bethesda, celebrated for its efficacy in paralytic affections; and leaving the city by the gate of St. Stephen, a short path conducts the traveller to the Mount of Olives, and the Garden of Gethsemane, at the foot of the valley of Jehosaphat, and on the sandy bed of the dried up brook Cedron. Here he will find, among the wells of Neomi, the tomb of Absalom and the field of Aceldama.

We have already remarked that the Hebrews sought their subsistence in the riches of the earth. There never was, in fact, a people, who devoted themselves so completely to agricultural pursuits as the Hebrews, since their territory sufficed for their consumption. Not that they were altogether ignorant of other arts. We have already observed, that they understood the fabrication of metals, and the cutting and carving of wood and precious stones. They had also among them joiners, carpet-makers, embroiderers and perfumers.* From the time of Moses they possessed excellent workmen, of whom Bezaleel and Aholiab (who

* Fleury, *Mœurs des Israelites*.

constructed the tabernacle) were examples; but, whether these famous artificers had been instructed by the Egyptians, or whether they were endued with supernatural power, as Scripture gives us reason to think, it does not appear that they had any successors, nor that, until the time of the kings, there were any Israelites who worked professionally for the public.

Some passages of Scripture prove, that at the commencement of the reign of Saul, they had no workmen who understood the forging of iron, and that they were compelled to resort to the Philistines for the sharpening of the tools which they used in tillage; to which necessity they were perhaps driven by the oppression of that people, who would not suffer them to fabricate arms.

There is also reason to think that bread was not publicly sold, and that they were not in the habit of keeping it by them, since we find the high-priest, Ahimelech, giving David some of the shew-bread, which it is not probable he would have done, if it could have been procured elsewhere. This seems the more likely, as the Witch of Endor made bread expressly for Saul, when she gave him food to restore him to his senses.* It is also certain, that every house had its own oven, as intimated in the threatening passage, which says, that the people shall be reduced by so sore a famine, that ten women shall bake their bread in the same oven.† Each Israelite cultivated his own inheritance, which had been portioned out to his ancestors in the time of Joshua. He could not change his locality, nor impoverish or enrich himself to any considerable extent—the Law of the Jubilee having provided against it, by revoking every 49th year the alienation of lands, and forbidding, every sabbatical or seventh year, the exaction of the payment of debts. The uncertainty of obtaining reimbursement increased the difficulty of borrowing, which likewise tended to prevent them from impoverishing themselves. The impossibility, besides, of acquiring territorial property repressed ambition and restlessness; each contented himself with the lot which was his birthright, and devoted all his efforts to the improvement of it, knowing that it would certainly belong to his posterity.‡ This attachment was, indeed, a reli-

* Samuel, ch. xxviii. v. 24.

† At the present time in Syria, Phœnicia, and Palestine, dough for bread is prepared daily in every family, and sent to a common oven, established in the cities, from whence it is carried to be eaten.

‡ We deeply regret, that in the learned exposition of M. Depping, on the double character of mercantile selfishness and religious fervour of the Jews of the middle ages, he has maintained an absolute silence respecting the Samaritans of our day. That fraction of the tribe of Joseph, which has preserved its ancient characteristics of profound and lively nationality, as they were given by the inspired liberator in the desert, has, in manners, habits, or principles, nothing which resembles the European

gious duty, since it was founded on the laws of Moses, and a memorable instance is given of it in the refusal of Naboth to sell the inheritance of his fathers.

We have endeavoured to shew that the Israelites, who, under David and Solomon, had carried on a foreign trade, after the time of Hosea, owing to the superior skill and competition of the Phœnicians, altogether abandoned it. Their traffic was reduced to an internal one, and their navigation altogether ceased. It cannot therefore be correct to say, that they were the principal means of communicating the arts of industry to other countries, or that they were the sole possessors of those arts. On the contrary, if a people are to be judged of by their ordinary habits and pursuits, it may safely be asserted, that they preferred the pastoral life to all others.* The Jew did not seek to acquire riches in adventurous voyages, nor had he, like the Phœnician, any taste for a life of turmoil and danger. His enjoyments were of a more peaceful character; he was satisfied with small gains. The extent of his ambition was, to sit under the shadow of his own palm, to gather his dates, olives, and figs; to milk his ewes, to tend his cattle, and to behold them enjoying their luxuriant pasturage. The objects which called forth his regret in captivity, were, the pleasant banks of the Jordan, on whose willows he had suspended his harp and psaltery.† Religion lent her aid in giving strength to these sentiments. The promises of God to his people regarded blessings such as more immediately descended from above. He spoke not to them

Jews,—calculating, and avaricious traders, who have retrograded to the worship of the golden calf. It is well known, that the Samaritans who dwell at Naplouse, the Green Road, named by Jacob “Halket-assamara,” where he fixed his abode, as it is stated in the Book of the Law, have synagogues, houses and cemeteries peculiar to themselves, and that they neither eat nor form any connexion with the Jews, whom they anathematize. Their laws are however the same, and contain 613 precepts, but there are some capital differences in those which concern purification, and the Samaritans refuse to eat of animals killed by the Jews.

* The *Bedouin Arabs*, whether of Asia or of Africa, live as their ancestors formerly lived, in Mesopotamia, (to day Diarbekr,) at the time of Abraham and Hagar—that is, scattered over the territory of Algiers. They rear numerous flocks of cattle, speak the Arab tongue with purity, preserve their simple, patriarchal manners, dwell in tents, and retain all the habits of their Asiatic brethren. Those tribes which inhabit the environs of Algiers are under subjection; those which wander towards the mountains of the south, remain independent, and are extremely hospitable. The name of Bedouin is derived from an Arab term, which may be rendered by *campestris*; they are likewise denominated *Scinitur*, from the Greek word *σκιτινός* (in tentoriis habitans). The tribes originally *Saracens*, or more properly *Hagarenes*, that is to say, in Arabic, descendants of *Hagar* and *Abraham*, by their son *Ishmael*, have spread themselves from the desert of Arabia, to the south of that continent, as the Scythians and Tatars have done towards the north.

† *Elisha* when called before the King of Israel to predict the future, demanded that a minstrel should be brought him,—“And it came to pass, when the minstrel played, that the hand of the Lord was upon him, and he said,” &c. &c.

of gold, nor of silver, nor of jewels, nor of costly furniture, nor of other riches produced by the ingenuity of man; but he promised them refreshing showers to fertilize the earth, and to cause it to bring forth fruit in abundance. He gave them food and raiment, safety, and peace, and victory over their enemies. He made them to increase and multiply. He blessed their flocks, their herds, their storehouses, and their wine-presses. Such were the gifts which the Almighty vouchsafed to shower upon the Israelites, and the object of which was to impress upon their hearts the important truth, that they were specially appointed to uphold, in the midst of a heathen and idolatrous world, the worship of Him, the only true God, and the Creator of all things both in heaven and earth.* It is interesting to follow, in the valuable work of M. Depping, the track of the Israelitish nation in Europe, during the middle ages. He prefaces it by recounting the recital of their melancholy adventures and the principal events of their primitive state. In the latter pages of his introduction, he follows them from the borders of the Euphrates, where they wandered with their flocks, to the philosophical schools of Alexandria, where their Rabbins, in constant contact with the Grecian Sophists, insensibly imbibed that tincture of Platonism, which they endeavoured, by means of subtle arguments, to incorporate with the doctrines of Moses, and those of the Magi. Some curious details on this subject are also to be found in the Theological Literature of the Asiatic Jews; who carried the mania for explanations to so extravagant a pitch, as to maintain that every passage of the Bible was capable of 600,000 interpretations.

We become thus acquainted with the nature of the education bestowed on those Jews who mingled with the European nations. We see this mighty and wonderful nation, so long the chosen and protected of God, ultimately dispersed, abandoned, proscribed, and cast out of the pale of human laws. They become altogether a discarded race, to whom the other nations, Christians as well as Musselmans, as if by common consent, refuse even a resting-place. For guides and instructors they had no better than sophists, casuists, and dreaming mystifiers; and their subversion and exile was the more painful and irksome, as they

* There is no doubt of the palm, the fig, and the olive, as well as the vine, having been cultivated on a large scale by the Jews. The city of Jericho was called "The City of Palms." The Bible speaks of the palm trees of *Deborah*, situated between *Ramah* and *Bethel*, and of those on the banks of the Jordan. The Hebrew coins bear the distinct impression of palm trees, with their fruit, which, as well as the bunches of grapes, were stamped on them as marks. Pliny, Theophrastus, Tacitus, Josephus, Strabo and Diodorus, speak also of groves of palms, situated in Palestine. The two last-mentioned historians are forcible in their praise of the vines of Judea, and in numerous verses of the Bible mention is made of vineyards. The Feast of Tabernacles was celebrated at the termination of the vintage.

had no other code of religion and morals, than what was contained in books, fitted only to lead their minds astray, and render them objects of suspicion in whatever quarter they might endeavour to fix themselves. We do not mean to assert, that when they were driven from their native land, they carried with them those mysterious writings; but most of them were, more or less, imbued with those extravagant ideas which took their root in the schools of Susa and Babylon, and transmitted to their children the practices and absurd belief which the doctors of those schools had erected into dogmas. The same people, whose obstinate resistance to the Romans caused the destruction of Jerusalem, seem, in their exile, to have patiently submitted to the yoke which was imposed on them by their own doctors, and whilst they revolted against the emperors, they became the willing slaves of the Talmud; comforting themselves in all their vicissitudes with the doctrine held out to them by their learned professors, that circumcision was the sure path to eternal happiness. We lay aside with regret the work of M. Depping, but are anxious to arrive at the conclusion of those questions which we have proposed to ourselves to solve. It has been already stated, that the Phoenicians, and, at a subsequent period, the Carthaginians,* their descendants and rivals, were, by means of industry, by their knowledge of the arts and manufactures, by their extensive commerce, and their experience in navigation, the first promoters of civilization in the world.† And it was to the Phoenicians, at once their neighbours and enemies, that the Jews of early times were in the habit of resorting for artisans on those grand but rare occasions, when they were desirous of increasing the magnificence of their religious cere-

* History of the Carthaginians, by M. le Docteur Botticher, Berlin; Of the Religion of the Carthaginians, by Münter, Copenhagen; The *Idéen*, from Heeren, Leipsic; Discoveries of the Carthaginians and Greeks in the Atlantic Ocean, by M. Lelewel, Warsaw and Paris.

“ Carthage, the most powerful of their settlements (Themisond), according to a tradition, the truth of which there is no reason to question, owed its origin to the crime of a king of Tyre, who, urged by avarice or ambition, murdered his brother-in-law, the priest of Melcarth, their national god. Many of the citizens, offended and alarmed by this atrocity, resolved to leave their native land, and placing themselves under Elissa, the widow of the slaughtered prince, they put to sea, and directed their course towards Africa. They disembarked in the bay in which Utica and Tuneta were already built, and fixing on a narrow promontory which runs out into the sea, they agreed to pay for it a price, or perhaps an annual tribute, to the Libyans, who claimed the property of the soil, &c.”—*Connection of Sacred and Profane History*, vol. iii. p. 163.

† Heeren is of opinion that the Phoenicians, like most other commercial nations, began by making piratical excursions to the towns and villages adjacent to the shores they frequented. This conjecture carries with it such an air of probability, that we willingly adopt it, although it does not rest upon any certain authority. In the history of that nation, it is unfortunately but too clearly proved, that they, as well as the other nations of antiquity, engaged in the traffic of slaves.

monies, by the addition of curious and highly-wrought embellishments. It was the city of Tyre which furnished Solomon with the architect for his temple, and with the sculptors who were employed in its embellishment; and this beautiful and magnificent edifice, the account of whose construction and decoration we read of in Scripture, and which was not unknown to the ancient Greeks, may be considered as a model of Phœnician architecture. The trade of the Tyrians, which embraced the borders of the Red Sea, and the islands of the Grecian Archipelago, extended itself in one direction to the sources of the Ganges, and in another beyond the Pillars of Hercules, penetrated into the Northern Ocean, beyond the Britannic Isles, explored the coasts of Africa, and attempted the circumnavigation of that vast continent. This vast commerce was the *Briareus* of the Asiatic Mythology, which brought into direct communication Egypt and Greece, Chaldea and Etruria. In those days, indeed, a merchant was not simply a mere purchaser and seller of goods, whose knowledge was confined solely to money and merchandize, but something of a far higher cast. He was a sort of intellectual and moral agent between different nations, who, among the commodities which he conveyed from one to another, carried with him those objects which were the signs of moral and religious feelings. Through his instrumentality knowledge was disseminated. The gods of unknown nations passed from hand to hand, and were at one and the same time, articles of commerce, objects of worship, and specimens of art. The Phœnicians, who alone possessed the means of this enormous traffic, thus became the common agents of other nations. From this circumstance, no doubt, arose that prodigious confusion of mythologies and of symbols which overloaded the religious creeds of the Asiatic kingdoms, and which may be observed in the second era of Grecian civilization, notwithstanding that its rudiments, drawn from an eastern source of a still earlier date, had, until that period, maintained its original simplicity. This was the origin of those idols of divers forms, attributes and symbols, and those monstrous combinations of beings of a double nature, which became incorporated into the religious systems of Egypt, of Chaldea, of Phrygia, and even of Phœnicia itself. These images, hawked about by the bold and adventurous navigators of the latter nation, and afterwards exposed in their warehouses to the credulity and curiosity of the Peloponesian population of the islands and continents of Greece, became, by this means, the first objects of a rude worship, and the earliest models of their art. Symbols of these are still occasionally discovered, variously modified according to the progress of civilization, upon the primitive monuments of Greece and Etruria.

The Phœnicians (so called by the Greeks)* which were a part of the Aramaic or Syriac race, were spread over the territory which is bounded on the south and west by the Red Sea and the Mediterranean, on the east by the Tigris, and on the north by the mountains of Armenia. In this immense country, the portion which they occupied consisted of that part of the coast which lies between Mount Lebanon and the sea. Their towns were erected on the margin of the shores of the neighbouring isles, and at the foot of the mountain. The limited extent of their territory, and the timber which they procured in abundance from Mount Hermon, Mount Lebanon and Mount Bashan, were instrumental in rendering the Phœnicians, at a very early period, a commercial, a navigating, and ultimately a colonizing people. The spot which presented itself for their first excursions was the Isle of Cyprus. This was about their first station in the Mediterranean. They were not long in extending their settlements to the western extremities of that sea, exporting to the different places the manufactures of the mother-country, such as trinkets, metals in various forms, glass ware and woollen and cotton goods, and importing from thence in return wine, oil and dried fruits.

It was, however, in the north of Africa and in Spain that were established the greater part of the Phœnician colonies. Although we are ignorant of the precise manner in which they became acquainted with the Spanish continent, we know from authentic sources that they traded with that country more than 1000 years before the Christian era. The *Tarshish* spoken of in the Hebrew books, is indubitably the *Tartessus*, of which mention is made in the Greek writings—a generic term, adopted probably to designate the rich countries of the west. According to ancient tradition, the Phœnicians, when they first visited Spain, found gold in quantities so abundant, that all the utensils made by the inhabitants were formed of that metal. Not only were their vessels freighted with it, but, laying aside all their instruments and weapons composed of less precious materials, they constructed others of gold, and even forged anchors of silver. They established colonies or factories at Gades (*Cadiz*), at Malaga, at Hispalis (*Seville*), and other places; and leaving the *Heres* and the *Turditanians*, the ancient inhabitants of their countries, to work the mines, they confined themselves to exchanging the merchandize of the east, and the produce of their own manufactories, for the metals, the wool, and the fruits of Spain. They also kept up an active trade with Babylon. Caravans evidently descended through lower Syria by way of Balbec (*Heliopolis*), passing by Tadmor (*Palmyra*), which place Solomon may have in all probability re-

* Herodotus, liv. iv. c. 104.

paired, fortified and aggrandized, although it certainly existed before his time, notwithstanding what the Hebrew historians say on the subject.

The oriental branch of the Phœnician commerce took a northerly direction. The people of *Javan*, *Tubal* and *Mesheck* were great traders. They brought to market slaves and brazen vessels. Those of the house of *Thogarmah* trafficked in mules and horses. By *Javan* is meant the *Ionian Isles*; *Tubal* and *Mesheck* are always understood to signify the *Tibareni* and the *Moschi*, tribes dwelling at the north of Armenia, near the Euxine and Mount Caucasus, and designated in the Hebrew writings by the name of *Thogarmah*. From the three first mentioned countries the Phœnicians obtained slaves and copper utensils. Cappadocia, and the countries situated south of the Euxine, formerly furnished slaves in such abundance, as to lower their price to 4 drachmas a head.* The Grecian colonies established north of the Euxine, likewise procured a considerable number of slaves from Scythia. In this respect we follow Josephus, who generally employs but one name to designate those neighbouring countries which had the same population. His view of this subject bears a striking character of exactness and truth. Copper is to this day very abundant in those countries, and the vases made of it are highly esteemed. Armenia Minor was celebrated for its horses, horsemen and mules. It encouraged the breed of the *Nysean race*, from amongst which the satrap of the province chose annually 20,000 colts, to send to the King of Persia; from which circumstance some critics have contended, that by the term saddle-horse is to be understood the *Nysean horses*, or war-horses.†

If in the preceding statement there is nothing which indicates a great degree of industry as to manufactured works, on the part of the Phœnicians, beyond that of a simple exchange of commo-

* The price of a slave at that period was about 3s. At the present day the traffickers in human flesh ask for each of their victims from 2000 to 2200 f., about £80 sterling. Slavery not only degrades, but kills its victims: it goes far towards the extinction of the species, which extinction would have been already consummated without the support afforded by a new nourishment. Excessive labour is in great measure the reason of the mortality among the poor blacks. Want of care, unwholesome diet, unmerciful and frequent chastisement, sufferings physical and moral, and the feelings of dark despair which they engender, are so many concurring causes. This mortality is of frightful extent. M. M. Hilliard d'Auberteuil, Col. Malenfant, Gregoire, Moreau de Tours, Humboldt, Poivre, &c. relate that from 1680 to 1776, viz. in ninety-two years, more than 900,000 negroes had been imported into St. Domingo: in 1777 there remained in that colony only 290,000; of whom only 140,000 were black Creoles. In the Island of Cuba, the mortality, according to Humboldt, is 7 per cent. per annum. *The Anti-Slavery Monthly Reporter*, No. 26, states a loss in the slave population, from 1818 to 1824, amounting to 31,419.

† The province of Khorassan, or the "country of the sun," is the native country of the famous *Nysean horses*, so much extolled in history.

dities, we are not to conclude that their country was unproductive in raw materials for exportation, nor in manufactures to exchange for the goods it imported; for possessing only a narrow strip of coast, and being forced to seek abroad for the first necessities of life, they were not only a commercial, but a manufacturing people. Although it must be allowed in the first instance that they possessed but few raw materials with the exception of their timber, yet they were considerably advanced in the mechanical arts. Thus, all the glass used in the ancient world was the produce of Phœnicia, which alone possessed the species of sand necessary for its formation. But if the architecture of the ancients furnished little or no occasion for this article in the formation of windows, it caused, on the other hand, a considerable consumption of glass ware for the table and for mirrors. In this branch of industry, Sidon was the Venice of the ancient world. In the prophet Ezekiel we read of the glories of Tyre, the superb queen of the Mediterranean, and the vast bazaar of the eastern world, opening her ports to receive the merchandize of every land. Hither the Egyptians resorted to dispose of their manufactures of fine cloth, and the Greeks for the purchase of slaves. By land her gates received the caravans of Arabia Felix, arriving from Eden and from Canneh, heavily laden with precious gems, with spices, and with stuffs. At the period in which the prophet penned his magnificent description of this city, Rome had not yet taken her rank among nations, but was slowly converting her cabins into cottages, and waiting for the time when her cottages should give place to houses and palaces.

The Phœnicians fabricated, as we have already mentioned, a great number of ornaments, in ivory, amber, odoriferous woods, gold, silver, ebony, and brass; for it was they who ministered to the luxury of neighbouring and distant nations.* Isaiah gives us a formidable list of the jewels and ornaments worn by the beauties of Judah, and it is probable that the ladies of Damascus and the other towns of Syria and Phœnicia, were not behindhand in the decorations of the toilet. In the Odyssey we read of the Phœnicians who frequented some of the Grecian ports, carrying with them

* The superior richness of the urns and ornaments discovered in Ireland, compared with those found in English barrows, is fully acknowledged by Sir Richard Hoare. "The Irish urns were," he says, "in general more ornamented, and the articles of gold also richer and more numerous."—*Tour in Ireland, General Remarks.*

"Within the limits of my own knowledge," says Rev. W. Hamilton, "golden ornaments have been found to the amount of near one thousand pounds."—*Letters concerning the Coast of Antrim,*

In like manner a variety of swords, discovered in Ireland, are as exactly and as minutely, to every apparent mark, the same as found in the field of Cannæ, which are said to be Carthaginian.—*Governor Pownall's Account, 1774, to the Society of Antiquaries.*

jewels and ornaments for the women, which they exchanged for articles of consumption (*βίοτος*), probably corn, wine and oil. The cities of Phœnicia, girt with walls and rich with industry, rose up in the midst of this country long before Athens was in existence. Their principal manufactures were woollen cloths and dyed cottons, to which latter the *murex*, which abounded in their seas, furnished them with the means of imparting the most brilliant colours, causing the tissues of the Phœnicians to be held in such high estimation by all nations, that we can assign no other limits to their commerce in this manufacture, but those of the then known world. Nevertheless these shell fish contained so small a quantity of real colour, that those mantles or purple stuffs which derived their tint from them were sold at an extravagant price, and were only attainable by a few individuals of great wealth and high rank.

At this epoch the Tyrians founded, on the northern coast of Africa, the city of Carthage, and beyond the Straits of Hercules, at the point of Bœtica, the town of Gades, situated on the sea coast, about two-thirds of the way between Tyre and the Tin Islands, which they had discovered in their long voyages at the extremity of Britain, called by the natives Sorlingues, but to which the Phœnicians gave the name of Cassiterides or Tin Islands, from their having there obtained a supply of that metal.* If we seek to discover the cause of the decline of Phœnician prosperity, it may be accounted for, first, by the foundation of Carthage, which quickly absorbed all the commerce of Spain; secondly, by the manufacturing industry of the Grecian colonies of Asia Minor, which maintained an active connexion with Thapsacus, on the Euphrates; thirdly, by the grand political commotions which overthrew the western part of Asia; and, lastly, by that law which, in the progress of events, prevents the continued duration, for a series of ages, of any nation which has but partly attained the highest degree of civilization.

It is a subject worthy of notice, that the predictions which the Jewish prophet addressed to Tyre have been exactly accomplished. That once proud city, *whose merchants were princes and whose traffickers were the honourable of the earth*, is now a rock, on which fishermen dry their nets. The "*daughter of Tyre*" has undergone a no less striking change. It is now 2000 years since the names of Tyre and Carthage, the two greatest commercial powers of antiquity, have been struck out of the list of nations.

* The intercourse in very ancient times of *Albion* and *Jerne* (two Celtic names) with Spain (Gades and Gallicia), appears to be a fact that does not admit of question. The great probability is, that from the latter country (Spain), on the coast of which they are known to have early established themselves, the Phœnicians, the first great prosecutors of navigation and commerce, carried forward the chain of colonisation to Britain, Ireland, Gaul, &c. and there planted arts, letters, and religion.

Thus have we briefly attempted to show the large share which the Phœnicians took, by means of their navigation and commerce, in the diffusion of industry, of the arts, and of religious worship throughout every other nation of the ancient world.

A question of the most important nature is left to the intelligence of our era to solve. It is to determine by means of the sculptured monuments which science has recently acquired, what part of its religious images and sacerdotal types were brought into Greece from Upper Asia, by the commerce of which the Phœnicians had in the earliest ages of society obtained the monopoly, and which they sought to maintain even at the expense of life itself, since the human sacrifices, which never failed to accompany their establishments, had for its sole object to serve their interests and to protect themselves in the enjoyment of their monopoly. The painted vases of primitive formation, and Grecian medals of every date, furnish certain references on this point, which in our opinion have not hitherto met with the attention they merit, as they might prove excellent guides to that small number of the truly learned, who, in their researches into antiquity, seek to elucidate the characteristic traits and features of so important an epoch of history. Time has obliterated, and, it is to be feared irreparably, the great monuments of art, and of the religious worship of this people. Their temples are annihilated, and with them the idols they enclosed. It is perhaps, however, not impossible to trace some feeble idea of these ancient representations in the monuments of other days. The Hercules (*Melkart*) of Tyre, and of Tarsus, the Venus (*Astarté*) of Sidon, the Atargatis of Ascalon, have not disappeared so entirely, but that some idea of them may be gleaned even from these memorials, at once recent and superannuated, which characterize the expiring struggles of Polytheism, when, in order to dispute the ground with Christianity, the idols of former ages were drawn from their ancient sanctuaries under the absurd and hopeless expectation of reanimating a creed already extinguished.* It is thus that the worship of Astarte Baalis, the Great Triple-headed

* The *Ismenian Apollo* was worshipped at Thebes, and *Esmeum* appears to have been amongst the Phœnicians a divinity endowed with the same attributes as the *Æsculapius* of the Greeks; and further, the sea-goddess *Ino-Leucothoe*, is styled by Homer, daughter of Cadmus; and although Homer has not explained what was to be understood by Cadmus, yet it is not at all improbable that in the Grecian mythology there may be found ideas of navigation, and recollections of maritime origin. There existed in the Isle of Cyprus a temple consecrated to the goddess *Aphrodite*, who bore a strong resemblance to the Syrian *Astarte*, which proves a connection between them and the Greeks of Laconia. In the Island of Thasos, and on the coast of Thrace, gold mines were discovered. Herodotus relates that those of the island were opened for the first time by the Phœnicians, adding that the Tyrian Hercules (*Melkart*) had a temple on the spot. Herodotus is generally so correct, that we are strongly inclined to rely on his statement, although his partiality for all that relates to Upper Asia and to Egypt renders him liable to be deceived by slight appearances.

Goddess of Syria, again re-appears in the sacred city of Hierapolis, at an epoch when it had long fallen into disuse, and that the Paphian Venus seems to have renewed her existence in the representations which are given of her upon the more recent monuments. We see also, in Asiatic Greece, the Goddess Nature revived at Ephesus, Perga, and Samos, where, assuming her ancient form, she contrived to obtain that worship which was refused to her at a subsequent period, in spite of the embellishments she received from Grecian genius. With this view, likewise, Septimius Severus, in his indefatigable and desperate struggle against Christianity, was induced, by a desire to rival the miracles of the Christian religion, to undertake the restoration of the statue of Memnon,* and, finally, it is thus, that in almost every quarter ancient Polytheism, in its expiring moments, presented the singular spectacle of a simultaneous reappearance, and drew out all its old images, from their dusty receptacles, as the last resort of a worn-out faith! Spectres of customs which had passed away were recalled to a temporary existence, and then consigned to perpetual oblivion!

The climate of Syria is delightful, and not less so that of Phœnicia, (the maritime part of Syria): its sky is blue, like that of India; its sea warm and transparent; the walls of its cities shine like silver; and the sand of its shores glitters with red and purple. A city bearing the name of Eden, and rivers called Lycus, Belus,† Orontes, Adonis, are still extant. Its trees are the tamarisk, the palm with its white head and its slender and elegant stem, the

* It is well known that the statue of Memnon was supposed to render harmonious sounds, when touched by the first rays of the sun. This colossal monument, whose height was forty-eight feet, without reckoning the pedestal, which was twelve, and the throne upon which it was seated, which was fourteen feet high, was situated in that quarter of the tombs denominated by the Egyptians *Memnonia*. The Greeks, profiting by the resemblance of names, metamorphized *Aménophis* into *Memnon*, giving every morning a vocal salutation to *Aurora*, his mother. It was broken about the year 27 before Christ, by an earthquake, and restored by Septimius Severus, who wished to make use of it as a weapon against Christianity. With what enchanting harmony must the son of *Aurora*, at one time, have ravished the ears of the numberless pilgrims, who assembled from all quarters, to hear his divine accents, since even in his mutilated state he still rendered sounds of so much sweetness—what resource would Christianity be able to oppose to this wonderful display of God-like power? Vain was the hope! The deity remained silenced for ever more, the prodigy had ceased with the causes which had produced it; it is proved by geological observation, that cracks in granite will emit, under certain atmospheric circumstances, sounds more or less sonorous at sun-rise. In the quarries of Syene, in the Pyrenees, in the granite rocks which border the Oronoko, similar sounds have been observed;—the sighs of the fabulous son of *Aurora* were of this nature alone, and ceased to be heard when masses of stone had been placed upon the cracked fragments which produced them.

† Belus, a river of Syria, falls into the Mediterranean near Ptolemais. It abounds in sand fit for the manufacture of glass; and it was there that glass was first invented. —*Plin.* v. c. 19, l. 36, c. 26.

caroubier, with its bronzed foliage, and its trunk of polished brown, and the sycamore with its branches like a vast parasol, forming a convenient shelter from the sun, whose fervid rays gild the clustered blossoms of the nopal and the perfumed fruits of the orange and banana. Its snow-clad mountains are darkened with the cedar; and its valleys, where graze the hind and the gazelle, are carpetted with anemonies, and planted with lemon-trees, pomegranates, figs, mulberries, masticks, and rhododendrons. Their cities are Tyre, Antioch, Palmyra, Emese, Heliopolis, Helbon, Damascus, Sidon, Ptolemais, &c. &c. Antioch, Aradus,* Berytus,† Sidon,‡ Tyre,§ Ptolemais,|| are on the coast; Emese stands on the banks of the Orontes, near Mount Lebanon.¶ The houses are washed by the rapid and crystal waters of that lovely river; the cloudless sky unites the horizon with the summits of Mount Lebanon; and when the morn tints its snows with a thousand beautiful colours, it is impossible for the eye to determine, in the uncertain distance, the boundaries either of sky or mountain. At Emese stood that temple dedicated to Halgah-Baal, of which the young Antoninus was high-priest, previous to his becoming emperor. This temple was placed upon a hill, overlooking the city and the river; it commanded a view of the snow-covered tops of Lebanon, the roses of whose valleys filled the air with their delicious perfume; groves of olives, dates, tamarisks, and sycomores, shrouded it with a canopy of verdure, under whose shade sported fawns, antelopes, and hinds; while the lake reflected the light foliage of the trees, and the brilliant azure of the sky. This lake was inhabited by multitudes of fishes of various sizes, white, red, and gold: they were deemed sacred; many were ornamented with collars of pearl, and would come when called by their names. The Cosmogonists of the East affirm, that the world rose out of the waters; an idea which was no doubt derived from a tradition of the Flood. In the midst of the lake stood an altar, which the votaries who offered flowers and incense approached by swimming. The temple faced the East; it had in front an immense court, surrounded by innumerable porticoes and columns, resembling those of Heliopolis (*Balbec*), and Palmyra. In Egypt and in Asia columns are symbolical of the fire and heat of the sun. In the middle of the court were two of those coarse images by which the heathens were wont to express the idea of

* Founded by Seleucus Nicator.

† Modern *Berut* was the birth-place of Sanchoniatho, the ancient historian of Phœnicia; Byblus (*Gebail*) was the country of Philo.

‡ Sidon, on whose ruins stands the modern *Seide*.

§ Tyre, now *Sour*.

|| Ptolemais (*St. Jean d'Acre*).

¶ *Lebanon* signifies in the Hebraic language *white*, so called from the perpetual snow on its summit.

re-production. The doors of the temple, its ceiling, and roof, were all of gold—whence breathed the most delicious odours, like unto the perfumes of Arabia. Strains of music and brilliant illuminations were continually added to the delights of this embalmed atmosphere; and three hundred priests, in linen robes, with golden tiaras on their heads, worshipped in a cloud of incense the five deities, *Gad-Baal*, *Baal-Phegor*, *Halgah-Baal*, *Baal-Samen*, *Baal-Zebub*; and the three goddesses, *Baalis-Astarte*, *Baalis-Benoth*, and *Baalis-Derceto*. *Halgah-Baal* was the supreme deity of the temple, and was not represented under any image; one of those rough stones, called Bethels, or Betyles, received in his name the offerings of the Syrians; this stone was black, and of a conical form. *Halgah-Baal* was considered as the great and ineffable god, the sun in his attributes of creator and preserver. *Baal-Phegor* represented the sun in his fertilizing power. *Gad-Baal*, the sun delivering oracles (Phœbus, Apollo). *Baal-Samen*, signifies in the Syrian language the god of day. *Baal-Zebub*, god of those flies which hatch and live in the sun's rays. *Astarte-Baal* was a golden statue, seated on a throne of gold; she was represented with three heads, each surmounted with a mitre and towers, like those of Cybele, a crown of rays and a crescent; her body was covered by an albe, over which she wore a tunic, and upon that a cape, embroidered in pearls and emeralds with the twelve signs of the Zodiac; a lion stood on each side of her; in her left hand she held a dulcimer, a distaff, and a caduceus; in her right she grasped the thunder; on her arms were carved insects, flowers, fruits, a bow, and a torch. Such was the supreme goddess—the spouse of Halgah-Baal. She represented the moon receiving light from the sun—nature vivified by his beams.*

* Those two luminaries, the sun and the moon, are still objects of worship among the Celts—who fall upon their faces and repeat a *Pater* and an *Ave*, when the moon rises.—(*Cambry*, vol. iii. p. 35). In many parts it is styled “our Lady.” Others uncover themselves when the planet Venus appears.—(*Cambry*, vol. i. p. 193.) A solitary stone stands near Morlaix (Department of Finistere-Bretagne) in memorial of the deplorable fate of a peasant, who, as a punishment for blasphemy, was swallowed by the moon; veneration for lakes and fountains is likewise shewn; on certain days are placed near them offerings of butter and of bread.—(*Cambry*, vol. iii. p. 35, also *Depping*, vol. i. p. 76). In the Orcades, even within the last few years, a bride, before her marriage, went to the temple of the moon to invoke Woden.—(*Logan*, ii. 360.) The feast of the sun is still celebrated in a village of Dauphiné, according to Champollion.—(*Figeac on the Dialects of Dauphiné*.) At the fête of St. Jean they assembled to behold the dancing of the rising sun.—(*Rodin, Recherches sur Saumur*.) The inhabitants of the Anjou styled the sun “Lord,” and the moon “Lady.”—(*Rodin, Recherches sur l'Anjou*, i. 86.) All these statements, however, require examination, as they denote superstition of the grossest nature on the part of these people.

The great number of breasts, with which the body of the Ephesian Diana was surrounded (from which she was called *multimammia*, πολύμαστος), confirms the opinion of some learned antiquaries, that the *Egyptian Isis*, the *Greek Diana*, the

Bualis-Benoth was the Venus of the Latins,—*Bualis Derceto* the Grecian Aphrodite, represented with the tail of a fish, as a symbol of the earth coming out of the waters. All these idols were of gold, and glittering with jewels; their altars were covered with precious offerings from Arabia, Abyssinia, Phœnicia, Cappadocia, and Pontus. The daughters of Emese were wont to advance in a chorus of song, to place garlands of roses and the choicest perfumes of Arabia upon the altars of their divinities. Their priests were habited like women. They carefully plucked every hair from their faces and bodies, and painted their perfumed skins with white and red. Their flowing robes were draped in coquettish folds, and their hands and arms covered with rings and bracelets. They danced before their gods, and chaunted hymns to the sound of triangles and dulcimers, and the virgins of Emese, perfuming their hair with the essence of roses and the Iris, joined in the ceremonies of their temple, and assisted in the celebration of the death and resurrection of Adonis.*

From this voluptuous worship we may well hasten to purify our thoughts with the truths of a religion which comes home to our reason and to our hearts, and which leads to the conviction that it is our duty to promote the well-being of our fellow creatures. We can prove, that although we recognise the existence of religious systems, which have produced a certain degree of civilization, yet in fact social order made no real progress before the establishment of Christianity. Let us first take philosophy in its highest degree of splendour, when it flowed in clear and mellifluous strains from the lips of Plato; from those of Aristotle, dry and pedantic; Pythagoras, the superstitious dreamer, and very far inferior to the disciple of Socrates. Plato, in his theory of ideas, raises philosophy above the powers of man. The logic of Aris-

Phrygian Rhea (from the Hebrew word *Rahah*, "to feed"), the Syrian *Astarte-Bualis*, were the same divinity—all emblems of fecundity. They were also crowned with turrets. It is very observable that almost all the statues of the Ephesian Diana have a crab upon the breast. Montfaucon says the signification is uncertain. Not at all: every one agrees that the representation of the Ephesian Diana was taken from the Egyptian Isis; and all authors, both ancient and modern, affirm that the overflowing of the Nile becomes remarkable generally at the summer solstice. How then could the Egyptians represent fertility better than by placing on the breast of their goddess Isis, or universal nature, that sign in the zodiac, which denotes the summer solstice, when the fertile water of the Nile begins to diffuse plenty over the face of their country? Their fictitious animal the Sphinx (from the Hebrew word *sphang*, signifying overflowing), a figure composed of the body of a lion, and the head of a virgin, denotes plenty spread over Egypt, by the overflowing of the Nile during the time the sun passes through the signs of the lion and virgin, which immediately follow the summer solstice.

* It is noted by Montfaucon that Moses does not mention any temple of architectural construction. He only made an altar, surrounded with twelve pillars, what we should call a cromlech and stone circle, in the construction of which all hewn stone and iron tools were prohibited.—(*Exod.* xx. ver. 25, xxiv. ver. 4.) Thus Stonehenge is of the most ancient form of temple.

totle exalts mankind above philosophy. The civilization of Greece owed to these men the three elements of faith, reasoning and revelation, answering amongst the Hebrews, to Moses, the Pharisees, and Jesus Christ. Plato was never comprehended by the ancients; Christianity was required in order to render him intelligible; his genius which soared so high in the regions of dogma and theurgy, did in fact, in a mysterious manner, designate the Trinity; he admits a Being infinite, absolute, and uncontrouled, from which emanates the word (*λογος*). From that essence which he elsewhere styles the Son (*υιος*), proceeds the soul (*ψυχη*). These ideas are vague, obscure, and undefined, and emanate from an imperfect knowledge of an original and primitive system, affording powerful evidence, that the human soul, in its attempts to soar to a higher world, and purify itself by a contemplation of Deity, resembles those old pictures which dipped in acids regain their freshness and their original colour. Christianity enlightens our conceptions of God, and through faith renders him accessible to all. He becomes palpable to the affections. The law of his nature, mysterious and incomprehensible as it is, is revealed in the creation—that is to say, by the manner in which he operates upon the world and upon human nature. God beams upon our souls and stamps his own image upon us, as an artist on the work of his own hands. If God had not given us a threefold capacity, and endued us with physical, moral, and intellectual functions, united in one whole or individual, it would have been impossible for us to have comprehended his nature; one being can have no knowledge of another, unless they both possess some common property. The God of the Christians is a great intellectual and moral Being, whose essence is universal love and benevolence. The ancients could only discern this principle through indistinct traditions; a spiritual and occult cause can only be appreciated by its operations; nor was it in the power of the scholastic philosophy to discover and comprehend it. Aristotle goes by rule: his metaphysics, which consisted of syllogisms, start from too low a point to obtain a full view of such a subject. According to his theory, man is the productive element of morals and science; he disengages an idea from his mind, and gives it currency by the power of speech. His system rests upon natural and human impulse. Christianity, on the contrary, has a more exalted source, and teaches us that reason is revealed to the mind of man, and that all is the result of one great spiritual Cause, whose diffusive and infinite power presides over all. God is the soul of our reason, the light of our intelligent nature, and the centre of our affections. This is the sublime theory contained in the sacred volume. Viewed in connexion with this first, sole, and independ-

ent cause, let the world and animated nature be studied and analyzed in all their ramifications, and let the perfect law of love be adored in all its inspiring emanations. Christian metaphysics enlighten and purify the understanding, resembling those "tongues of fire" which rested on the heads of the disciples of Christ.

The primitive Christians testified the utmost contempt for the philosophy of the schools. The Bible contained in their estimation every species of knowledge which could be useful to mankind, although in a brief and concentrated form. They preferred gathering the ripe fruits of this soul-strengthening and life-giving tree, to throwing away their time in useless speculations on the nature of the soul, the origin of ideas, and the theory of morals. In constant contact, however, with the Pagans, they were compelled to enter the arena of polemics, and to use the same weapons as their antagonists. Philosophy, therefore, became to them an arsenal from which they drew those weapons that could be rendered serviceable in the defence of Christianity, and by which they were not only able to sustain with advantage the assaults of the ancient logic, but to become in their turn the assailants, and drive the enemy from his stronghold. This distinction then existed between the philosophy of the Gentiles, and that of the Christian; the one was the constant disputant in religion, whilst the other acted as its guardian. A philosophical school was placed near the temples of the Christians, as a sentinel is posted at the gates of a palace: and this proves that Christianity could bear the closest investigation. Aristotle, to the astonishment of all, appears to have laboured for the Son of Mary. The Scriptures afford a key to the writings of Plato; the convictions of faith sustain the attacks of reason, like a giant wielding with one hand both sword and buckler.

This alliance, however, gave birth to interminable controversy. The middle ages confounded the form with the substance, and a curious coincidence in the opinions of Socrates with those of the Fathers, caused human reason to be considered all powerful, and led by a rapid descent to the doctrine of Eclecticism, which gleaned indiscriminately from the words of man and those of God. What was most wanting in the system was universality and the strength of reasoning. In quoting the opinions of his predecessors, the philosopher, unassisted powers was constantly collected together all those ideas which man had retained, but to form a system, he was obliged to have recourse to dogmas which he opens and displays before the world, and places example before precept.

to find true philosophy unassociated with Christianity; or at least, let us acknowledge its sublime principles, as the germs of the progress of the human intellect, in the arts, the sciences, and in industry; principles which the Christian Church has through a series of ages infused into the whole of our intellectual nature. What *chefs-d'œuvre* of art has Christianity given birth to! What deep and powerful feelings has it raised in the imagination of the artist! Michael Angelo felt in his inmost soul the immensity of Deity, when his mighty genius displayed itself in the magnificent structure of St. Peter's—Raphael has shed rays of divine lustre on the heads of his Madonnas. Correggio has thrown into his canvas a flood of celestial light and beauty in the heads of his angels, and the countenances of his Virgins. Those sublime and majestic strains which were poured forth by Handel, Pergolesi, Haydn, Mozart, and Cherubini, owe their existence to the same inspiring cause. Had not their souls been filled with divine ideas and Christian sentiments, their music would not have been what it is, capable of elevating the heart, and conveying to the soul those secret raptures which raise it to the contemplation of its God. Sacred music is both edifying and consolatory. It withdraws the thoughts from this world of misery and suffering, and transports us to a higher sphere. It produces a holy abstraction from earthly things, and raises our ideas to a celestial abode. It is to the same high and exalted feelings which have been engendered by Christianity that we owe those beautiful and splendid edifices, the cathedrals of Europe, which are suspended over our cities, and are the visible types of our religion, resembling it at once by their vastness and simplicity of design; and their minuteness and complexity of detail. How grand are the effects of that brilliant variety of colours displayed in their casements; through whose variegated panes the radiance of the sun produces a bright assemblage of rubies, emeralds, and starry wheels, which appear to revolve like those of the car of Elijah. In these majestic temples of the 14th century, the mind of man finds space to dilate itself; and in contemplating the lofty nave, his thoughts soar upwards and ascend to Heaven. Where are there to be found structures of similar character, and so fitted for duration, among the master-pieces of antiquity? These churches with their low pillars, secluded aisles, and dark masses of stone, have an air of mystery, grandeur and solemnity, which is vainly sought for in the finest edifices of more modern eras.

Those men of the olden time arranged the stone, handled the pencil and the pen with the fervour of religious feeling; their devotion aided their work; their verses dropt piously and simply from their lips, like the beads of a rosary. Christianity pervaded the

air in those days, and was inhaled with the breath of life.* One species of production was wanting, even during the most religious eras, and that is, a history of the advancement of Christian knowledge, in a style as exalted as its subject. The chroniclers of the middle ages existed under the influence of the Latin authors. Sallust, Tacitus, and especially Livy, were the guides they imitated. Bossuet produced a voluminous work upon the sacred history of antiquity, but he touched upon that of modern times in a very superficial manner. The advent of Christ was not only an act of the divine nature, it was also a most important link in the chain of human events. If we take the world as it was under the dominion of the Romans, we find traditionary facts, distorted by error and corruption. If we contemplate the forests and steppes of the north, menacing the incursion of an overwhelming torrent of barbarians, and the brutal and selfish ignorance of the multitude, brought into contact with the misguided errors of Rome—what would have been the result? An endless perpetuity and increase of ignorance and blindness, terminating in utter darkness.

It was necessary then to the existence of the civilized world, that the Roman empire should be the depository of a germ of life and light, in order that in the great amalgamation of nations which afterwards ensued, barbarism should become softened down by civilization, and ignorance yield to truth. The Roman empire was on the wane, and with it the influence which it exercised over the minds of the mass of mankind. At this juncture Christianity stepped in, and preserved society from falling into a state of utter dissolution. If we interrogate the past, before we anticipate the events of the future, and refer to former facts, coupling each occurrence with those which preceded and succeeded it, we shall have a key to this wonderful dispensation.

From the era of Calvary, mankind classed themselves under two denominations, the Christian and the Jew. The one, invested with the law of love, and the means of religious improvement, marched with firm and confident step towards his high destiny; the other, branded on the forehead with a bloody stain, roams, like a second Cain, over the world, a mere animated corpse, possessing neither motion, impulse nor spirit, to pursue the path of knowledge; floating about as chance may lead, to vegetate like

* The predominant expression visible on all the productions of Paganism, is that of physical qualities, as more adapted to a society based upon animal powers. Thus the admirable *Venus* represented sensual love, corporeal beauty, and fertility of nature. The *Apollo* and *Bacchus* were likewise types of bodily endowments. *Diana* with the *Fawn*, and the *Gladiator*, were symbols of activity, *Jupiter* and *Hercules*, models of physical power. Modern art, on the contrary, has comprehended, felt, and expressed the more intellectual and spiritual elements of human nature.

seed borne upon the wind. To the Christian was promised a progressive advance towards a futurity of everlasting happiness; he was exhorted to rely upon God's mercy and providence, and was guarded by that sustaining arm, to seek for brethren beyond the polar seas, and within the torrid zone; and to bear to each extremity of the earth's surface, the blessed doctrines of liberty of conscience and of person. The fetters drop from the hands of the slave! No longer shall he be the property of his fellow man: he is the child of God! The sentence pronounced upon the Jew, and its accomplishment in this world, is universally known. Both Jew and Christian afford equal testimony to the truth of Christianity; the one by the duration of his punishment, the other by a merciful system of pardon and deliverance.

Since that period, empires have been overthrown: nation has risen up against nation, and creeds have been swept from the face of the earth. Two alone remain as they originally were, the Christian and the Jew. Pagan Rome was never reformed by Christianity. One system can never be superseded by another without being entirely demolished; to do this was the mission of the barbarians: all Europe was in conflagration; it seemed as though Etna had opened her crater, to pour forth men. A torrent of barbarians overflow the country, and commit unheard-of ravages—the Roman world falls prostrate, and soon becomes a heap of ruins, but over these ruins is erected a Cross! Behold the miracle produced by Christianity; the world would have ended, had not her principles been those of life. Had the barbarians remained unambitious in their native forests, Rome, dissolute and voluptuous, had slept the sleep of death and of annihilation. One error would have given place to another, nor could there have arisen knowledge, virtue, wisdom or social improvement. We shall trace no further the effects of Christianity upon the moral progress of the middle ages. This important subject would require a separate article. It is enough for us to have established the fact, that it was through the intervention of Christianity, that the civilized world was rescued from barbarism, and we repeat, that the whole human race would have been sunk in one common abyss of destruction had not its natural energies been aided by Christian principles. In the two following centuries, by their aid, a prodigious advance was made by the barbarians in civilization. Christianity was the originator and guide in every step that was taken.* Christianity, when properly apprehended, embraces the whole of man; it penetrates the very depths

* The philosophers of the last century, with Voltaire at their head, took a fancy to constitute themselves the panegyrists of the Emperor Julian, the apostate restorer of an erroneous, worn-out creed, which had been proved by experience to be destitute of

of our souls, and imbues the nature of our being. By means of the productions of industry, it finds access to the outward senses; through the medium of the sciences, it addresses man's intellectual faculties; and by means of the fine arts, it speaks to his feelings; and eventually engenders the faith which is the result of conviction. The doctrine of the Gospel is love! Christianity blends mankind together, and unites all human beings with their God. Truth reaches all understandings, Charity all hearts. Powerful union, in which all individuality is lost! Noble alliance, whose members unite themselves in one great body! This unanimity increases from age to age, and will be the great law of future times, when Christianity shall have performed its ultimate work.

The middle ages were only outwardly religious. The age of Louis XIV., who considered a massacre of the Protestants the readiest way to ensure his own salvation,* if it believed at all, denied its creed by its actions. The present era has too much of speculation and theory. Liberty of opinion, equal participation in divine things, and universal charity, are the fundamental principles of the New Testament. Extend thyself, O Christian World! let thy benign influence spread over the sea and land, uniting all mankind in one bond of love, to the Lord Jesus

those vital principles necessary for the improvement and prosperity of mankind. These insensate plaudits of the philosophers are so many outrages upon the social order and improvement of the human race. In rejecting Christianity, which is productive of every social good, Julian, whose education had been in the school of adversity, (not always sufficient to form the minds of princes), mistook entirely the necessities of his own era, and the interest and well-being of mankind.

* Can we call that an age of faith in the precepts of Christ, can we entertain the faintest idea of the principles of Christianity, when it is impossible to form a just calculation of the number of Christians immolated by the intendants, governors, and other executioners of the *Edict of Revocation*, in the Cevennes, on the gibbets erected by order of the Abbé de Cayla, and of those whose limbs were broken in the Ceps, (a new instrument of torture, invented by that chief of the missionaries in Languedoc, at his chateau of *Mont Vert*).

In submitting himself to the double tutelage of the Jesuit Letellier, and of Madame de Maintenon, Louis XIV. was persuaded to sign that edict of Revocation, ruining France by the emigration of 40,000 manufacturers and workmen, who carried into Germany, Holland, and England, their capital and their industry. (Hence the origin of the silk trade in Spitalfields.) The exasperation of Louis against the Protestants was as cruel and impolitic as it was unjust. The persecution of the Jansenists would only have been ridiculous, had it not been accompanied by 8,000 *lettres-de-cachet*. His having twice ravaged the Palatinate by fire; his persecution of Fénelon; the gallantries and ruinous follies of Versailles, where the "Grand Monarque" figured as Roger and the Sun at the same time; that singular succession of concubines at court even during the lifetime of the Queen, one of whom, Mademoiselle de Fontanges, squandered upon her toilet 100,000 crowns per month, sufficiently prove our assertions (respecting "le grand Siècle.") See Letters of Madame de Sévigné, 1674, of September or December, on the subject of the hangings in Brittany, of which she speaks with a degree of levity which shows the spirit of the age, or rather, we should say, that of the court.

Christ; thus shall the entire universe become one great family, "in one fold, and under one Shepherd," holding all things in common, and for the benefit of mankind at large. The expanding charity of Christ can alone work out this prodigy, since it is he alone who has said, Ye are brethren.

We cannot conclude our article without offering to Dr. Russell, the learned author of the *Connection of Sacred and Profane History*, our tribute of admiration, and, which will assuredly be felt by every one of his readers capable of appreciating him, at the vast erudition displayed in his work, as well as at the extent and variety of his researches, and the force and clearness of his reasonings.

It has been said of the celebrated Michaelis, that he had found in preceding commentaries on the Bible, and in the different branches of theology which form their ground-work, rude and misshapen materials, with which he had succeeded in building up a solid and regular edifice, capable of being adapted to every subsequent expansion which new wants might create, or a new state of things might render necessary or desirable. It is precisely of this sort of expansion of which the work of Dr. Russell, now before us, affords a beautiful specimen. In this indeed consists its chief value. The mode in which he has treated the subject changes the face of those sciences which are connected with the exposition and interpretation of the sacred traditions; and this it does, not by shaking their foundation or perverting their object, but by throwing upon them that light which the author has derived from his profound knowledge of the history and civilization of the East, and his acquaintance with those languages akin to the Hebrew tongue, and with the arts and industry of the nations brought into contact with the Jews, aided by judicious and philosophical criticism, full of those ingenious combinations which give so much value to isolated facts, such as would be otherwise barren and devoid of interest.

The views entertained by this learned writer respecting the manners, customs, arts, knowledge, industry, trade, monuments, laws, and institutions of the Jews, and the various phases of their destiny, as well as their relations with other ancient countries, are explained with clearness and order in a series of chapters, which together form a valuable body of scriptural archæology.

It would be difficult to praise too much the sagacity of his conjectures, or the originality of his views, or the felicity with which Dr. Russell explains and interprets a variety of points which have been hitherto buried in obscurity, or have been neglected as unimportant in the history of the nations of antiquity by the almost innumerable host of commentators who have preceded him.

The time, labour, patience, perseverance, learning, and penetration which such a work requires, are almost incalculable. The examination of texts, the references to ancient works, the collation of manuscripts; the critical study of both Testaments in connection with profane history, the comparative ages and values of different editions, their relations to each, the authority and fidelity of the versions of different times and in different languages, the inquiry into the authenticity of certain parts of the canonical books, the moral and literary appreciation of all the monuments and documents which are capable of throwing any light upon the past or present state of the sacred and profane texts, or upon the nature and origin of those changes which time or other causes may have introduced into them;—all these various forms of investigation and labour must certainly have occupied a very large share of the time and attention of the author, during a long series of years.

Yet the perusal of the work occasions us to regret that the learned author has not given us a more complete view of the religious systems of India; that he has not, for instance, entered more largely into the schism of *Buddha*, and its effects upon the state of that part of the world. Originating in India, the religion of Buddha, which rallies to its tenets about three hundred millions of sectarians, spread itself to the North and to the East among the Tartar and the Gothic nations, who were the barbarians of the Chinese world, as the Huns and Vandals were the barbarians of the Roman world, and gave birth to the *Lamuis*m established in Thibet. In a country of castes and exclusion, this religion has had the effect of destroying castes. It proclaimed that all were equally under the protection of the Deity. Persecuted by the Brahmins, Buddhism has enjoyed the glory of martyrdom, having set the seal of its blood to the benevolence of its creed. There is scarcely a Christian virtue which it has not preached. It enforces not only humility and charity, but likewise the subjugation of the sensual desires. Its morality embraces lofty and extended views, in which one may recognize an almost evangelical purity and excellence. The love which overflows and extends itself beyond the ordinary limits of humanity—even to plants and animals, and breathes the sweet savour of a tender pity, pervades this religion in a remarkable manner.* It was favourably received, and indeed, eagerly embraced in China, where, perhaps, it was necessary in order to withstand the natural inclinations of a people enslaved by their appetites and their material interests.

* *Do not light the lamps for fear of the butterflies*, is a sentiment replete with feeling, and which at once goes to the heart.—See the book on *Rewards and Punishments*, translated by M. Remusat. Paris. Firmin Didot.

Buddhism might almost be designated the Christianity of the East; imperfect and incomplete, no doubt, but still wonderful and admirable, as far as it went. This is so true, that in no heathen countries has Christianity been planted with greater success than in those where Buddhism had previously prevailed. Buddhism seems to have moistened and softened the soil, and disposed it to be fruitful, whereas Brahminism and Islamism scorched and dried it up.

There appears to be a remarkable distinction in the general character of the East and the West. The East invents and preserves, the West applies and improves. Languages, religion, sciences, arts, games, have all originated in the East;* but there are none that we have not adopted and improved upon. To enlarge and perfect seems to be the genius of the West. The East may be likened to a vast pacific ocean, and the West to a river which flows from and is maintained by it, but which widens and deepens as it proceeds; and notwithstanding turnings and windings, and occasional checks, its fertilising waters roll onwards, diffusing plenty in their course over the face of remotest regions.

We could have wished that Dr. Russell had favoured us with a map of ancient and modern geography. Such a map, embodying all that is ascertained by the investigations of recent travellers, and illustrated as it would have been by the text, would have given additional value to the work. Notwithstanding, however, these points, the volumes of Dr. Russell contain a complete treasury of facts, traditions, materials, and discussions, which are compactly and ably embodied by the skill and judgment of the author, and, as such, are worthy of being in the hands, not only of churchmen and theologians, but of all who are desirous that their views and convictions upon this very important subject should be grounded upon a conscientious and deep inquiry into it.

* The manufacture of silk and porcelain, the art of dying, the composition of ink, the engraving on metals, on wood and stone, the inventions of the compass, printing, clocks, signs, paper-money, gunpowder, playing cards, and chess, are all derived from the East.

ART. VI.—*M. Cousin's Report on the State of Education in Holland, translated by Mr. Horner. 1838.*

THE few pages, which we now submit to our readers, are to be considered as a mere sequel or postscript to former observations, spread through several numbers of the *British Critic*; and, as there are cogent reasons why we should abstain from offering opinions which are liable to controversy, we shall content ourselves with some brief and simple statements, which recent circumstances seem to require at our hands.

We have heard, with the liveliest satisfaction, that there is an immediate intention to establish, under very high auspices in the Church, Middle or Intermediate Schools between the Proprietary Schools in connection with King's College, and Parochial Schools in connection with the National Society. It is probable that, in the interval which must occur between the writing and the publication of these sentences, some Prospectus will be put forth, or some active step will be taken. But it is also probable, that, even if we waited, we should have no time left for any accurate examination of the specific plan; and it may be better on other accounts, that, *before and without* any positive acquaintance with it, we should give at once our own independent views upon the subject.

Yet we need not say "*should give.*" We have already given them, again and again. And, therefore, it is not too much to assert, that we take in any such scheme a strong and almost parental solicitude; since for four years, at the very least, it has been near our hearts and upon our minds. A few extracts from our former disquisitions will place the matter beyond a doubt.

In an article, written in the year 1834, and published on *the first of January, 1835*, upon "*The Progress of Popular Education in France and England*," we had been speaking both of the instruction afforded to the poor, and also of the foundations which had been laid for the solid and ornamental education of the higher ranks, and the improvements which were taking place, with a generous spirit of rivalry, in our public schools and universities; and we then added—

"There is, however, another class, of which the position is not so favourable. We mean the class which is situated between the higher and middle ranks, on the one side; and, on the other, the persons who, for themselves or their children, enjoy the benefit of national and parochial schools—the class, for instance, composed of petty dealers and shopkeepers in towns, and small farmers in the country. We really

think that, at the present actual state of progress, this class will soon be less provided with the means of valuable education, than the classes which are below them. They are above the sphere in which mere charity revolves; and yet their circumstances will not allow them to take advantage of the London University, King's College, and the schools in connection with those institutions; while the private seminaries, to which their children can be sent, have oftentimes no other recommendation than a correspondence with the limits of their income. If, in addition to reading and writing, the elements of history, geography, natural philosophy, mathematics and music—to say nothing of 'logical exercises,' 'the arts of painting and design,' and other proposed additions—are to constitute the *minimum* of instruction in a good national school, the child, whether male or female, will there very soon receive a better education, both in quantity and quality, than the child of parents somewhat more elevated in the social scale. Even now, if examined as to religious knowledge, as before the ceremony of confirmation, the former has for the most part a manifest superiority over the latter.

"Here, then, is a gap. Here there *may* be a derangement of the social system. Here is a field of benevolent exertion, wide, and almost unoccupied. Here the clergy, and the other influential members of the Church, may originate a design of vast utility, and take the initiative part. Here Lord Brougham cannot step forward, like Coriolanus, and say "*Alone I did it;*" nor can the Dissenters assert that they were foremost in the field, although it is remarkable that the chief strength of the Dissenters, particularly the Wesleyan Methodists, lies in the very class which we have pointed out. All, perhaps, that is necessary, will be to give an impetus, and set the wheels in motion. The parties most concerned will then bestir themselves for their own profit. It is not required to do all for them, but rather to put them in the way of helping and benefiting themselves; of combining and co-operating to exalt the character of the education communicated to their children; and establishing, perhaps, other proprietary schools, cheaper, more commercial, and more practical, than those which are already at work. We shall not now venture to propose any specific plan; but in treating of the social improvements, to which Christians should address themselves, we may seize an opportunity of recurring to the subject."—*British Critic*, No. XXXIII. pp. 70, 71.

On the 1st of January, 1836, we returned to the charge. In an article headed, "*How is the Church to be saved?*" and containing, if we may venture on the prophecy, some other suggestions which will yet bear fruit, our language was, after a notice of parochial and elementary education,—

"But this is not all. Education upon Church principles must at least be universal among Churchmen. We need scarcely allege, that the education of the Clergy themselves must be lifted up to the highest attainable pitch of solidity, and comprehensiveness, and spirituality. We would speak of all classes and all ranks. Assuredly, so long as the

Church itself is dominant, an education, not dissevered from the Church, must be dominant in our public schools and universities, and be so framed as to have a real and lasting dominion. Assuredly, it is a sacred obligation, interwoven with the very being of true Churchmen, that their sons and daughters should be educated, whether at home or abroad, in a reverential attachment to the Church, and in a correct acquaintance with its tenets and ordinances. Assuredly, too, something *must* be done with respect to persons whom we have already mentioned. We allude to the children of the humble tradesman, to the lower division of the middle order. Seminaries must be formed under the auspices of the Church in the interval, still gaping and yawning wide, between parochial and proprietary schools, between merely charitable foundations and such institutions as King's College. Otherwise, this class of the people, perhaps the most numerous, and certainly not the least active, will be more and more alienated from the Church, and either left to education in Dissent, or abandoned to a method of instruction, for the most part, quite impotent and quite miserable."—*Ibid.* No. XXXVII. p. 38.

In the April of the same year, we struck the same chord *again*. Then, in the very next number of this Review, we took a general but rapid survey of the "*Prospects of National Education*;" and we declared ;—

"When we would strike the general balance, there is a vast preponderance on the side of peril and difficulty. Let us *suppose* the upper classes safe ; let us suppose them placed above the influence of that intellectual and moral contagion, which floats in the atmosphere of ignorance or false knowledge ; let us *suppose*—and the supposition is even now a violent one—that adequate provision is made for the mental and spiritual wants of the humblest ranks among us :—still there remains the mighty chasm between—no, not chasm—but the mighty space filled up by a teeming population of busy myriads. *With* these myriads, and *for* these myriads, something must be done."—*Ibid.* No. XXXVIII. p. 475.

At pages 476, 477, we entered more into particulars, and then subjoined :—

"But already, *months and even years ago*, on more than one or two occasions, we have insisted upon the necessity of making strenuous efforts, as Christians and as Churchmen, for the education and subsequent instruction of the less opulent division of the middle ranks. Instead, therefore, of repeating our own opinions, *usque ad nauseam*, we rejoice to avail ourselves of the authority of Mr. Short, fully concurring in the general tenor of the extract which we subjoin, though not, perhaps, in every single observation."—*Ibid.* No. XXXVIII. p. 477.

The present rector of Bloomsbury proposed, "that a class of schools should be established in London, and other large towns, for the middle orders, such as the superior mechanic and the little tradesman, which should be carried on upon the system of mutual instruction, but in which much higher branches of educa-

tion might be introduced." "It can hardly be doubted," said Dr. Short, "that a large number of scholars might be procured at such a school, who would willingly pay at the rate of one shilling a week." Our own sentiments were thus summed up at the conclusion of the article.

"With all respect, then, be it said, that the members of the Church of England, and more especially the more exalted and influential members, must now, having first scanned the actual position of the empire, adapt themselves and their efforts to the new circumstances which have arisen; they must enter upon a bolder and more vigorous policy than they have hitherto pursued; they must act upon a larger and broader scale of operations; they must assume, we are unwilling to say a more aggressive, but a more active, and energetic, and conspicuous part. It is strange that we must tell Christians not to be too tranquil and too unostentatious, as if troublesomeness and ostentation could ever become virtues: but, in deed and in truth, they must "let their light shine;" or it may be extinguished. We are far from meaning that they should signalize themselves amidst the violence of controversy, and the strife of factions; but they must be *seen* to be foremost in all sacred enterprises; and what they do in the cause of spiritual instruction, of religious and useful education, of moral knowledge and enlightenment, of general amelioration and philanthropy, they must have the *credit* of doing. From principle, rather than from indolence, they have been fond of remaining in the back ground. The times demand that they should step into the front. They must be prominent. They must take the lead. Otherwise, amidst the countless projects of the day, and the restless officiousness of busy men, their merits may be unregarded, their influence may die away, their very existence may be left out of the account. They must bestir themselves; proceeding, however, by matured and well-digested schemes; not by rash measures, which may help to dismember instead of strengthening the Church, and where the remedy would be almost as grievous as the distemper. They must bestir themselves chiefly in two ways,—

"1st. By providing a directly religious instruction for the entire people, through the regular ministration of the Clergy in the parish or district, and in the consecrated place of worship, with an instrumentality commensurate with the exigencies of the land.

"2ndly. By labouring that there may be a good solid education, founded upon religion, and not disconnected from the Church, for all who need it; but especially for the less wealthy members of the middle order, both male and female:—thus helping to do for *la petite bourgeoisie* what has already been done for themselves by *la bourgeoisie supérieure*.

"These plans, separately so essential, have yet an intimate affinity: they will produce a tenfold benefit, if undertaken in conjunction; and, in fact, we can hardly hope that the due results will be attained, if there be only one without the other."—*Ibid.* p. 481.

And so we went on, almost from that time to the present, in

a number of passages, which may be easily adduced, if ever their evidence should be demanded.

But enough of quotation from ourselves. It would not be fair, in any way, to inflict more of the same matter again upon the same readers. We would only refer them to an article on "*Social Improvement in connection with the Church*," and also to another, in No. XLIV., headed, "*Sermon of the Bishop of Norwich—Education and Government*," for remarks on some incidental points connected with the main question before us, and tending to prove that we do not here introduce any new matter, but simply bring forward our previous statements as witnesses of feelings and opinions long ago entertained.

True it is, that we may not have any article to show, expressly devoted to this subject and no other. No; but why? Simply because there was nothing in existence, as far as we could discover, no English work except Dr. Short's brief pamphlet, and no English institution whatever, on which a direct article could be founded. We were always obliged to bring the matter into notice almost by violence; for the difficulty was, and the difficulty is still, that we could not find any peg on which to hang our observations.

These details may seem unnecessary; but we deem it right to go into them, not out of disrespect or dislike to any person or class of persons, but for the sake of the credit and honour of the members of our own communion. The question of education is called, and not without reason, "*the question of questions*:" the press swarms with educational projects, and many of these are mixed up with principles, which it is impossible for Churchmen consistently and conscientiously to recognize. The friends and the opponents of the Ecclesiastical Establishment are running a race of not altogether ignoble or unprofitable competition. But then it becomes well to recur to the simple evidence of dates; because much must depend upon priority in point of time. It is a very different thing, for instance, whether the plan of middle schools occupied the attention of Churchmen, so much earlier, or so much later; whether it was *actually promulgated* by them more than three years ago, or only in the present season; in the beginning of the year 1835, or only in the spring of the year 1838. For, in the first publication of the *Central Society of Education*, there is a note at page 59, in which it is stated, "We shall have occasion to publish evidence *at some future time* which will show that the schools for the trading and mercantile classes are very frequently mere *Ergastula*, to which boys are sent out of the way to be boarded and birched at 20*l.* a year." "We live at a time when the political importance of the humbler ranks

of the middle classes is rapidly increasing, and when the success of our national industry is as rapidly augmenting their wealth and their luxuries; but a large proportion of this very class is allowed to waste the only leisure period of a life of business in the worst establishments, professing to be establishments for education at all, which are to be found in Europe." It is said, likewise, in a paper on the Elementary Schools of Prussia, "at that period (up to the year 1770,) the elementary schools for the poorer classes were in a very low condition, which was the more to be regretted, as the immense distance between elementary and grammar schools was not then filled up by any of those middle schools, which at present afford the appropriate degree of instruction to such a large class of society." Such things happened, we are told, when "the whole system of education in Prussia was in no way superior to that adopted in England, nor was it materially of another character."

Now, if it could be made out that the Church-scheme only appeared *after* the date of that publication, we are quite certain that the old and impudent cry would be repeated, that English Churchmen were quite incompetent to frame for themselves any original conceptions; that they could only copy the ideas of more liberal and comprehensive thinkers; that they were still going upon the old tack, of first resisting plans, and then imitating or borrowing them when they could no longer be resisted; and that this scheme of middle schools no more appertained to any Churchman alive than to the man in the moon.

But if we can show beyond possibility of denial or misconception, that this plan was propounded by Churchmen *before* the date of Mr. Wyse's lucubrations, and before the birth of this Central Society;—if we can show that the same ground had been previously taken, that the same defects had been previously observed, and that similar remedies for them had been previously suggested; all these cavils, at least in the present instance, fall and crumble into the dust. This, however, must be shown by some clear and tangible manifesto;—by something, in a word, written, printed, and published; since, in such a case, private meditations will go for nothing, and *de non apparentibus et non existentibus eadem est ratio*.

With respect, likewise, to persons of a very different stamp, there may be considerable use in ascertaining and declaring how the case really stands. For to pretend that this subject had been altogether disregarded, or that it had not been seen in the full magnitude of its positive and relative importance; or that it was necessary for any gentleman, however respectable, belonging to any other communion, to press it upon the Anglican

Church, would be a complete mistake. The fact must be now apparent; we have ourselves mentioned it, not once, not unadvisedly, not incidentally, not lightly; but often, but deliberately, but earnestly, and as a matter of the gravest moment. We have given it its due prominence. We have done all that was in our power to place it and to keep it before the public eye. Not only we were not blind to the deficiency; not only we saw the gap and lamented it; not only we put our hand on that exact spot in the body politic; but we pressed the point till we were half ashamed of the importunate iteration, and feared that, without exhausting the subject, we had worn it threadbare. As to actual operations, we wished, of course, that the initiative steps should be taken by persons of far more weight and authority than ourselves; because we felt that, without their sanction and co-operation, such a design, after all, if attempted on any large scale, would prove, and perhaps ought to prove, abortive; and because it is a mere truism to remark, that of all projects in which the Church is immediately and deeply concerned the heads of the Church ought to be at the head. But, while it was not for us to take the lead in the practical undertaking, it seemed a duty incumbent upon us, in our mere connection with ecclesiastical literature, to familiarize the popular mind with the conception. We thought that this conception originated with ourselves; if we had thought otherwise we should have stated without disguise the source from which we derived it. This, at least, we can positively affirm, that, whether our recommendation of Middle Schools was or was not, anterior to others in point of time, it was made as the offspring of our own minds, and without any previous communication from any person in existence.

But let us be understood. We do not mean to arrogate an exclusive originality to ourselves, and so make a covert charge of plagiarism against others. The mere insinuation of such a charge would be invidious and, we doubt not, unfair. The *hiatus* must have been discernible, as a yawning gulf, to any man who took a comprehensive and enlightened view of the state of popular education. It is no wonder that the project of filling it up should have suggested itself, almost simultaneously, to many minds; the wonder would have been, that it should *not* have suggested itself; the wonder, perhaps, is—although there have probably occurred obstacles, with which we are not acquainted—that the work should have been so long delayed, and that its felt necessity did not sooner urge the most influential persons in the Church to undertake its accomplishment.

Still the simple fact remains, that we advocated the present plan in different Articles of this Review, before the Home and

Colonial Infant School Society was instituted, and before any of the persons, who are now prominent in pushing the design forward, had made, as far as we know, any *public* demonstration at least of their sentiments and intentions. We found many occasions,—and when we could not find them, we created them,—of calling attention to the principal features of the scheme of intermediate schools, to be made cheap, efficient, and attractive. We really are not aware of any advance or improvement upon the general principles which we have repeatedly laid down, or even of any other difference, than perhaps—for we have no means of speaking with certainty—a somewhat fuller development of them in their projected application. The frankness and straightforwardness with which we make these declarations will, we hope, procure us credit for being equally frank and straightforward in the declaration which we are about to make. We care nothing, then, into what hands the management of these schools may fall, provided only they are skilful and competent to the business; we have, personally, neither jealousy nor ambition on the subject; but we assert our share in the business, not for our own sakes, but for the sake of those Churchmen and those Church principles with which it has been our honest pride to be associated. On this account, we put in our claim; on this account, we would not willingly have it supposed that we have not been alive to the want of schools, such as are now, we trust, on the eve of being established; or that the matter, whether in its elements, or its details, is one which has escaped our notice, or awakened in us no interest. Let it be freely allowed, that this design is the natural growth of time and circumstance; that it has rather forced itself upon the age than merely presented itself to the mind of any single individual; or, in the words which Mr. Whewell has quoted for another purpose, that it is a thing *magis temporis quam ingeni*: but the more, therefore, should we regret, that our humble but persevering efforts should be put entirely out of view, when such institutions are planted and take root throughout the country;—as if we had actually lagged behind the march of contemporary thought, when, in point of fact, our most anxious meditations and our most strenuous labours—whatever their value and whatever their effect—have been devoted to the cause of general education in connection with Christianity, and social improvement in connection with the Church. At any rate, we discern in the present state of the undertaking a theme of congratulation to our fellow Churchmen, and to ourselves. If any men have been long desiring its success, and regretting not to see any apparent progress, let it be a fresh lesson to them, not to expect that general conviction is to be instantaneously produced, or that action is, of

necessity, instantaneously to follow conviction; but, not the less, to be resolute and persevering, never to be discouraged, never to despair;—let it be a fresh lesson to them, how plans, which are met at first with a frigid, apathetic, half-reluctant acquiescence, or even with sundry hints of visionary flightiness and utter impracticability, may yet ferment, as it were under ground, in a nation's mind, and break out at last in various quarters with an awakening explosion; like a fire, which it was for a time difficult to kindle, or which seemed extinct when it was only smouldering, but which on a sudden bursts forth in many places at once, and can set a whole forest in a blaze.

Matters having advanced so far, it must be a superfluous task to descant now upon the *want* of middle schools, or upon the *benefits* which must result from establishing them. The wretched inefficiency of so many "*seminaries*" and "*academies*," from the petty *dame-schools* upward;* the narrow compass of instruction, and the slovenly way in which even these scraps and fragments are communicated; the generally low state of *systematic* education existing in a class of persons, who are yet invested with an almost predominant influence, and rubbed by the collisions of the world, and the friction of political and social freedom, into much of acuteness and intelligence;—their too frequent estrangement from the Established Church; the danger lest they should be more and more estranged; and the necessity of attaching them betimes to its creed and discipline;—all these are topics, on which it would be as easy, as it is, happily, needless, to expatiate. At the same time, too, full justice could not be done them, without entering into a multiplicity of particular and local details which we have no space to afford.

There remain, however, two or three points, on which we must just touch, not in the expectation of settling them, but for the purpose of showing that we have not overlooked them.

* Even as to the points of *air* and *space*, and so, consequently, of health and vigour both of mind and body, a vast amelioration might be achieved. But here we can only make *another* reference to our former Article on the "*Social Improvement in connection with the Church*"; and would simply remark that, if the goal is to be completely gained, *physical*, and *architectural*, and *economical*, and *intellectual*, and *moral*, and *religious improvement*, must not merely be viewed as *separate* objects of inquiry, but must be taken together as the connected and mutually influencing parts of one mighty whole; they must be contemplated in their bearings and reference upon each other, both as to their *theory* or *general facts*, and their *statistics* or *particular facts*. How vast a field is open to Churchmen in that domain of social science, which relates to providence of habits, economy of diet, cleanliness, ventilation, and separation of dwellings; or, again, to wholesome exercise, simple pleasures, innocent recreations, and the sweet influences of nature! How much might be done, even here, to withdraw both adults and children from those vices, of which an enormous metropolis, full at once of luxury and penury, crime and concealment, is the pestilential hot-bed;—from those moral plagues, which crowded cities, in their actual state, infallibly engender!

1. The first of these is the *name* of the proposed schools. We have hitherto called them *middle schools*, for our own convenience. Yet, we are by no means disposed to insist upon this appellation; for, though it is comfortably brief, and, on the whole, sufficiently descriptive, it might not be found, in every case, altogether palatable to those, for whose use it was intended. The title *intermediate schools* lies nearly in the same predicament. The Germans, besides *Mittelschulen*, use the words *Realschulen*, and *Bürgerschulen*, which have been translated into *practical schools*, and *civic schools*; but neither of these terms seems preferable to *middle schools*. “*Burgher*” or “*Burgess*” *Schools*, or *Tradesman and Yeoman Schools*” would be scarcely better; and still less should we like any strange and pedantic designation, such as *Lyceum* or *Progymnasium*. We have heard the name *Commercial Proprietary Schools* suggested by one, who is as active and enlightened a promoter of general education as any man in the empire. It is possible, however, that one and the same denomination will not apply to all the schools which are wanted; for it may be neither expedient, nor feasible, to cast them all in the same mould, that is, to form them quite on the same pattern, or on the same scale of expense, or with the same list of teachers and studies.

2. For we come, as the second point, to *the persons who are to be taught in these schools*. Who are they? We should answer at once, *all* whose social position lies between the National Schools, and present Proprietary Schools. The Church is interested in the good education of all the children of the state; from the child of the highest noble, down to the child of the pauper in the workhouse. The Church, therefore, must cover with a good moral and intellectual tillage, all the ground which is now unoccupied; and get rid of an arbitrary and universal scheme of state-education by the only argument which will be convincing or satisfactory;—namely, by showing that the work may be achieved, and well achieved, by agencies already in operation. Nor do we see why middle schools, whether boarding or day-schools, should not be instituted for girls, as for boys:—nor why, to many of these middle schools, *infant schools* of a superior kind should not be attached, as several writers have already recommended the organisation, in suitable localities, of infant schools for the higher classes.

3. The third point is the *range of instruction* and the *mode of training* which these schools should exhibit. Here, we might talk much about the “education of the senses,” the development and exercise of the mental faculties, the cultivation and regulation of the mental powers. There would be no difficulty in putting out an imposing *syllabus*, to include religion;

ethics; English language and literature; French, if not German;—the rudiments of Latin; history; geography, physical and political; arithmetic; mathematics, both as a pure science and as applied to mechanics and the uses of life; natural history and philosophy, in their various branches; chemistry, for instance, in its application to trade and manufactures; the elements of the fine arts, music, drawing, æsthetics, &c. &c. We might add, too, the acquisitions of an *industrial* to those of a philological and scientific school. But such things are more easily managed on paper than in reality. It is, perhaps, enough to say, that the instruction ought far to transcend, both in matter and method, both in quantity and quality, that which is now conveyed to the same class of recipients. In all probability, however, the range of instruction must be much diversified; as the schools themselves must range through several degrees of our population, and extend, sooner or later, through rural districts, as well as towns.

4. The fourth point,—and it is one which the foregoing may help us to determine,—is *the footing on which these schools are to be placed, and the machinery by which they are to be worked*. Some propose a large society, having its centre in the metropolis, and its ramifications throughout the country. Others would prefer a combination of shareholders, not, perhaps, excluding honorary members. For ourselves, we deem some Association indispensable; but we would rather avoid what is technically called *a Society*. The Society must be either old, or new. If old, it can be no other than the National Society. But to engraft such a system upon the National Society would be hardly consistent with its specific objects, and would, surely, too much encumber and complicate its operations: while some soreness might be engendered by annexing these intermediate schools to a system in itself charitable and eleemosynary. A new Society seems even more open to exception. For our own parts, at least, we look with something of dislike and distrust on the multiplication of Societies in a church, unless their institution is attended with some immediate, undeniable, and mighty advantage. Too often, instead of becoming well-adjusted and well-proportioned parts of the same whole, they clash with the old Associations, and throw discredit upon them; or they tend to make men forget that the Church itself is, after all, the great society, through which the nation is to be improved and Christianized; they become *foci* of an irregular and unepiscopal authority, which may ultimately be fraught with danger and confusion, not merely to the establishment, but to the Church itself as a religious and spiritual communion. Neither can we well perceive, what benefit, otherwise unattainable, would be gained by the formation of a new Society for the

management of these middle schools. The object, it should be remembered, is not to bring under education children who are quite uneducated; for they already receive instruction, such as it is; and to schools, such as they are, they already go; neither is it, primarily at least, to raise funds; for the combination of proprietors would ensure cheapness; and the same money which is now consumed, would, perhaps, be found amply sufficient, if more wisely distributed and more economically expended. The chief fear, however, is, lest the formation of a society should excite jealousy, by having an appearance of ostentatious patronage, which would be injudicious on the one side and unacceptable on the other: lest it should take, or appear to take, the government of the schools almost entirely out of the grasp of the persons most concerned, namely, the parents of the children who would attend them. Yet these parents form no small portion of the "*Monarchy of the Middle Classes*." They are accustomed to the possession of power, and to the independent use of it. They are accustomed, and they wish, to have the management of affairs lodged in their own hands, and directed by their own energies. They think themselves quite as capable of self-government as any of their fellow-subjects; and they also think self-government better than a dictation or despotism the most paternal. They would like others to work *with* them, rather than *for* them. It would be a blunder to do too much, even in their behalf. True it is, as we have said, that the Church should pay attention to all classes, and to every individual in them all, at every stage of life. But the task here requires the nicest delicacy of handling. A quiet, unassuming, yet energetic, mode of procedure, would be, we imagine, the most effective and the least liable to misconception, though it might seem less direct and less imposing;—one, we mean, not far different from the measures which were pursued in establishing King's College. Let a good school be organized, as a model upon which, and a nucleus around which, others might be reared; having a strong committee composed of clergymen and laymen, and some distinguished prelate or prelates, for patron and visitor; let the parochial clergy, in their several districts, point out its advantages, and invite parents and guardians to send children to it, for their own and the common good,—and the thing is done. But we meant not to dogmatize: a new society *may* be found absolutely requisite: whether it should be called "*the Middle School Society*," or "*the Intermediate School Society*," or by any other name: for some of the schools may not be formed on the proprietary system, but may be merely kept up by a fixed payment, weekly, monthly, or quarterly, mounting from the rate of three-pence or six-pence per week to

a much higher sum. Let us only remark, that the plan should be expansive and progressive, pliant and flexible, easily turned into a variety of channels and adaptations, circumstances and localities. If it is too rigid and unelastic, it will fail of its purposes.

5. The last point but one on which we have room to animadvert will elucidate and strengthen this position ; namely, *the other institutions and means of improvement which may be joined and incorporated with these middle schools*. It may sometimes happen, that part of the existing machinery will be retained ; and that masters, for instance, of the present commercial establishments will change their plan, and become masters of schools on the new principle. But these cases will, perhaps, be comparatively few : for, although we are sorry to hurt either the interests or the feelings of any class of persons, we cannot but apprehend, that too many, who have never learnt any thing properly, think themselves qualified to teach almost every thing. Generally, therefore, we suppose, new buildings will be erected. In these, there may be sometimes what is called a *theatre* : there will be always a *large and capacious room*. Facilities, therefore, will be afforded to a system of catechizing ; or rather, perhaps, as we have before recommended, to a series of *theological lectures*, composed in a systematic but popular manner, which will instruct the middle classes, not merely in the plain doctrines and duties of the gospel, but in the history of their religion, and the constitution and polity of their Church. There might also be a *locus in quo* for evening lectures on subjects of general knowledge, not dissociated from Christianity ; and the same building might combine, at a great saving of expense, *two kinds of institutions, distinct, yet naturally and closely allied* ; namely, schools for the children, and places of intellectual advancement and recreation for the parents also, to which might be attached a *library*, a *museum*, and something of a *philosophical apparatus*, the master of the school being librarian and curator. We have always had in contemplation these, and other, possible accompaniments of middle schools ; not, of course, in all districts or quite at the beginning, but gradually and in favourable situations. In some cases, there might, perhaps, be annexed to them a *School of Arts* or a *School of Design*.

6. May we presume to add one word as to the *temper* in which this capital undertaking should be uniformly conducted ? We do hope, then, that the Church and Churchmen will conduct it,—even while it will do more to reclaim and bring back the stragglers of the population into their fold than any other means which they could use,—not as if a triumph over adversaries was the first thing in their view,—not as in the indulgence of a bristling and

splenetic opposition,—not as if chiefly animated by political or polemical animosity against this party or that sect,—but as in the natural performance of a task which Providence has intrusted to them, and of a duty which they owe to themselves; as in the calm and steady prosecution of their own legitimate objects;—those righteous objects which every churchman will appreciate according to the true amount of his patriotism and his religion, and which the national Church itself, to which, in theory at least, the whole nation spiritually belongs, is bound not to neglect.

But we have exceeded our limits, and must conclude; although we have only been enabled just to indicate topics which might constitute abundant matter for many copious and elaborate articles. Middle schools in connection with the Church are now likely to have an auspicious commencement: may they go on and prosper. Difficulties will, of course, arise. It may be more difficult for a time to work such a system in England, than in Scotland, or on the Continent. It will be difficult at first to establish one school on a model quite complete: it will be difficult at first to procure *good masters* for general superintendence, or *good teachers* in the several departments, or *good books* and *educational treatises*. But churchmen must begin to look, strenuously, carefully, and actively, to these things; and they may, at least, adopt that expressive word, which was chosen, we believe, for a motto by a Russian University, *Paulatim*. We have good hopes, even on human grounds; and—what is best of all—God's blessing may be expected.

It is self-evident, that we can be in no way pledged to the approval of details, which are not yet before us, either in the constitution or in the management of the proposed enterprise: but we hail with cordial satisfaction the practical recognition of the great principle, or object, which we consider to be two-fold; *first, to give to the "intermediate" classes, a higher, wider and better education, more in harmony with the general intelligence of the age, and the relation which they bear to the classes above and below them; and, secondly, to attach them to the Church by this the most potent of all agencies, the first in the order of time, and the first in the order of excellence.* We rejoice that the project is taken up, in the full devotedness of their zeal, by pious and unwearied servants in God's vineyard; and that laymen, whether of established reputation, or of the very highest promise, are aiding the good work. We anticipate the future with confidence: for we already see a glorious impetus imparted to the cause of education in connection with religion: we already see just and wide notions entertained both as to *persons* and *things*, the persons who require tuition, and the things which require to be taught:

we already see the true distinction taken between *training* and *teaching*, *education* and mere *instruction*; we already see all things beginning to be regarded, which go towards the foundation of a prudent, a virtuous, and a Christian character: we already see the philosophy of the subject, and the statistics of the subject, carried forward together, and tending to the completion and perfection of each other.

Since the foregoing pages were written and printed, we have had opportunities of knowing, that a plan for the formation and superintendence of intermediate schools has been matured. It would, however, be presumptuous and unbecoming in us even to touch upon the specific proposals, which, we believe, will be forthwith announced from the quarter to which they properly belong. Yet we may state our conviction, that the scheme will be found one emanating from the right source,—true to the cause of Christianity and the National Church; yet holding itself aloof from political faction, and seeking to enlist in its favour enlightened and conscientious men of the two great parties in the state:—clear and well-defined in its principles, yet not bound in its executive and administrative details, by a code of narrow stipulations:—distinct in its object, but, as to its means, able to take advantage of all the various agencies, and instrumentalities, and modes of proceeding, which may present themselves from time to time;—malleable into many shapes, susceptible of continual accessions and modifications, capable of almost infinite adaptation to the diversity of localities and circumstances:—holding friendly relations with the Church Societies already in existence, but itself having a Central Institution, and not a Society by name, for the basis of its operations:—effecting its purposes, partly by the introduction of a new machinery, partly by the adoption and improvement of the old, and wishing, therefore, to attach to itself the conductors of the present Commercial Schools, and to secure their cordial co-operation, rather than to injure their interests, as also to assist, rather than subvert the schools themselves, by affording to them encouragement and sanction, without a vain parade of patronage, by receiving them into union and alliance, by exhibiting a model in conformity with which they may be regulated, and by suggesting beneficial changes and extensions in their system of instruction.

Such, we imagine, will be the eventual character of the proposed design. The Bishop of London has already alluded to it in the

mon on the Daily Service of the Church, particularly in Cathedrals, preached in the Cathedral of Chichester, on Sunday, 19th November, 1837. By the Very Rev. George Chandler, D.C.L., Dean of Chichester and Rector of All Souls, St. Mary-le-bone. London: Parker. 1837.

IN order to understand the character and probable issue of the late Ecclesiastical Commission, it is necessary to trace the steps by which it has arrived at its present dimensions. It was ushered in and prepared by another, in many respects of a different character, that appointed June 23, 1831, "to inquire into the Ecclesiastical Revenues of England and Wales," which presented its Report June 16, 1835. For this was a *mere* Commission of Inquiry; and the Church had too much reason to desire such an inquiry — so preposterous were the statements of her wealth, which up to this point were circulated, and, because often repeated, were believed. With regard to the sister branch of the Church, in Ireland, they were acted upon; and even a member of the cabinet confessed, in a late stage of a bill affecting that Church, that they had been legislating under grossly exaggerated notions of her income. The good then to be obtained might make the Church acquiesce in the irregularity of the measure, and in the unlawful powers given even to that Commission. It might indeed have been better, had the ecclesiastical bodies or persons concerned addressed his late majesty to revoke that Commission, professing their readiness at the same time to give the information in some more legal way. For even that Commission was clearly illegal, the Crown having no right to make inquiry, unless it have, upon inquiry, the right to regulate; whereas the Crown has no more right to regulate the property of the Church, than to re-distribute that of the barons, who did indeed once hold of it. However, it seemed likely to lead to no evil results, since, in this Commission, legislation was kept carefully out of sight; the Commissioners themselves probably felt that they did not really possess the powers professedly committed to them, and so did not exercise them; no one, we believe, was "examined upon oath," and no one compelled to "produce any rolls, records, orders, books, papers, or other writings;" and although there were "178 non-returns among the benefices," and "223 among the impropriations," the Commissioners wisely abstained from pressing a claim, which might have been successfully resisted, and which would have brought the crown into disgrace. The returns then to this Commission were merely voluntary acts of courtesy; they were produced partly by that dislike which Englishmen have to any needless concealment, partly by the dread perhaps that the keeping back of the information would be imputed to the wish of concealing some extraordinary wealth, partly out of respect for the authority, although ille-

gally exercised, whence it emanated. The clergy had nothing to conceal, and so they told all, though they had no need. This Report also, we have reason to know, was probably, from the very machinery employed and the haste with which it was compiled, inaccurate, and for any practical purposes inadequate; it may, on the whole, very tolerably represent the whole amount of ecclesiastical property, although it probably overstates that of the deans and chapters; (and indeed, as the Commissioners soon discovered, the average of three years, as applied to them or to the bishops, was altogether absurd.) We know, from a number of instances, that the returns do *not* represent the real value of many of the benefices; we know, also, as was to be expected, that the clergy, in making the returns, proceeded upon no fixed principle, some making one deduction, some another; so that, as to details, this Report is not at all to be depended upon; not to mention the great alteration, which the Tithe Bill will soon cause.

This Commission, having completed its task, expired. Those who were in any influential post, will recollect the strong doubts which were felt as to the propriety of recognizing its authority; these doubts, however, as was stated, gave way, in most cases, after more or less of hesitation; a seeming straight-forwardness overbalanced wisdom; with some misgiving, especially on the part of those to whom age and experience had given wisdom, the inquiries were answered; and the first Commission having obtained its end, though with some difficulty, the way was prepared for another. The thin edge of the wedge had now been introduced.

In the first Commission, legislation, as was said, was carefully excluded; in the second, it was not yet introduced; but a further step was gained, by issuing a Commission, which should recommend with a view to legislation. Still, *through whom* that legislation was to take place, was not expressed; the consent of the Church, at least of her bishops, might, it was naturally supposed, be asked for. Then also people had, by the last Commission, become accustomed to the idea of a Commission; they had overcome and acted against their reluctance in the one case, and so, although things were now further advanced, they could the less readily or consistently act against the other. One may now see how much wiser it had been, had the chapters, *e. g.*, declined giving all information except in a legal way, and how much forethought there was in what, to younger men, seemed a timid hesitation on the part of the elder members of the cathedrals. Having gone, however, thus far in the one case, they could scarcely do otherwise than wait and see the result in the other. Then again this second Commission came from their friends, at a critical time; much, although a mistaken importance, was evidently attached to

it; and it might appear hardly grateful to embarrass by what *might be* a premature opposition, the whole measures of government. The king had cast himself upon those who advised this measure; much seemed at stake; and it was the more patient course, and incurred the least responsibility, to wait in silence. Whatever feeling then may have been excited by the first issuing of the second Commission, was suppressed, or at least held in, in anxious expectation of the result.

The objects proposed to the Commissioners were limited in many respects; they were appointed for

“ considering the state of the several dioceses in England and Wales, with reference to the amount of their revenues, to the more equal distribution of episcopal duties, and to the prevention of the necessity of attaching by commendam, to bishoprics, benefices with cure of souls: also for considering the state of the several cathedral and collegiate churches within the same, with a view to the suggestion of such measures as may render them most conducive to the efficiency of the Established Church, and for devising the best mode of providing for the cure of souls, with special reference to the residence of the clergy on their respective benefices.”

And the king, in his speech at the opening of parliament shortly after, adhered strictly to the same language;

“ I have appointed a Commission for considering the state of the several dioceses in England and Wales, with reference to the amount of their revenues, and to the more equal distribution of episcopal duties; the state of the several cathedral and collegiate churches, with a view to the suggestion of such measures as may render them most conducive to the efficiency of the Established Church: and for devising the best mode of providing for the cure of souls, with reference to the residence of the clergy on their respective benefices. The especial object which I have in view, in the appointment of this Commission, is to extend more widely the means of religious worship according to the doctrines of the Established Church, and to confirm its hold upon the veneration and affections of my people.”

The majority of two given to laymen at this first issuing of the Commission, excited probably melancholy forebodings in the minds of many,* as being a tribute to the liberalism of the day;

* To give one, and the earliest printed, instance, the advertisement to the “ Restoration of Suffragan Bishops recommended, as a means of effecting a more equal Distribution of Episcopal Duties, as contemplated by his Majesty’s recent Ecclesiastical Commission.” By J. H. Newman, M.A., 1835. “ The writer of the following remarks thinks it advisable to state at the outset, with reference to the recent Commission, that without pronouncing how far and in what cases the formal approval of the Church to the report of such a Commission may be dispensed with, agreeably to ecclesiastical usage,—or how far a Commission is of authority in which the lay members outnumbered the clerical,—or how far it is expedient or pious to alienate for the benefit of other places endowments left for the uses of particular sees or parishes, he desires to view the Commission as the expression of the Church’s wish for certain changes in her economy, sanctioned and farthered by the king, as her supreme governor, at the instance of the bishops, his natural ecclesiastical advisers.”

some, doubtless, objected rightly to the appointment of laymen at all. What had laymen to do with "the more equal distribution of episcopal duties," or how should they know in what way "cathedral and collegiate churches might be rendered most conducive to the efficiency of the Church?" Duties can only be thoroughly understood practically, "episcopal duties" by bishops; and the mode in which laymen have discharged the office, which during the disputed succession consequent upon the Revolution, they began to assume, of filling the cathedrals in the king's name, gives little ground to think that they understood what would "render them most conducive to the efficiency of the Church." These were purely ecclesiastical duties; and, thus expressed, we hardly see how laymen could think they fell within their province. At this crisis, however, it seemed wisest and most grateful to remain quiet; in political matters, these same persons had acted with a chivalrous disregard of self; and so with sorrowful thoughts how this concession on the part of the bishops, concerned with this arrangement, would end, and vain regrets that they had shrunk from the responsibility, and had not, like ancient bishops, taken the whole matter into their own hands, we had to devour our own griefs, and wait for the end.

The first Report of this Commission rather mitigated the apprehensions entertained as to the *extent* of the meditated changes, while, for the time, it took away all hope that sudden change could be resisted.

"No one," said perhaps the ablest advocate* of gentle and silent, in opposition to sudden, reform, "no one, who reasons, can doubt that from this moment the change which the Report proposes is the least which (humanly speaking) can possibly happen. Other governments there may be, but what government will do less? The changes recommended must be considered as actually achieved; the principles on which they proceed, as actually established, and their effects as inevitable. The battle has been fought, in a word, and is lost."

Discouraging as was the prospect of remonstrance or objection, there was also, in this first Report, but little tangible whereon to ground it. Most of it related to the bishops, and though the notice which seemed to imply the assent of the whole episcopal order was ambiguously expressed, it was enough to deter the lower orders of the clergy from interfering.

"We have used," it is said, "our best endeavours to learn the opinions of the several bishops, respecting these proposed arrangements, as far as

* Rev. Hugh J. Rose, *British Magazine*, April, 1835, p. 470. The feeling and vivid passage which follows these words, illustrates what are the feelings which these changes have torn up, while they have increased, not silenced, clamour.

they affect their respective dioceses, and have availed ourselves of many suggestions, which their local knowledge enabled them to supply."

This, in its plain meaning, implied the assent of the bishops; if it did not, the body of the clergy were unintentionally deceived; if it did, then probably the absence of direct opposition must have been misconstrued into assent; for we *now* know that many of the bishops did finally object to these measures, some consented to enlarge or contract their dioceses according to these new dimensions, very unwillingly, and upon much importunity, lest by holding out, they should overthrow a measure now agreed on; and into some of the arrangements they have not entered at all. At any rate, their assent ought not to have been even required within such a space; the six brief and exciting weeks which had elapsed since the appointment of the Commission, were clearly not enough to form, arrange, decide upon, propose, and receive the matured judgment of the several bishops upon a plan so intricate and involving so many and manifold considerations. Yet on February 5d, 1835, did this Commission appear in the Gazette; on March 17th the first Report was presented. Six weeks alone were allowed for remodelling almost every diocese of the Church in England, for re-distributing and re-moulding it. One should have thought that six times six weeks had been far too little for settling the first principles upon which such a distribution (if it were to take place) should be formed; one should think that, now the work is for the present accomplished, its very authors might look back with amazement upon their work and upon themselves. It seems more like one of those rapid transformations, which in boyish days one saw on the stage effected by the wand of the magician, than a real act, intended by real bishops to consolidate and strengthen the government of a portion of the Church of Christ. There seems ground to think that this implied assent of the majority of the bench of bishops, existed rather in anticipation than in reality; that the Commissioners consulted, upon some points, those from whom they wished for local knowledge, and looked to these schemes being eventually adopted by them, or enforced upon their successors. The public papers on the side of the then government had at that time an especial object in speaking of the consultations of the Commissioners, and it seems probable from the notices which these gave at the time, as well as from subsequent indications, that this first Report was the work of one or two bishops only.

Hasty, however, as this first Report was, it was altogether of a different character from its successors.

1. It proposed, indeed, that two bishoprics should be merged in adjoining bishoprics, and two new ones created. A hazardous step, truly, if this were to be done by the Crown, since in our

Church there was no precedent for it, except in the iniquitous times of Henry VIII. Nor did even he suppress any ancient bishopric.* The erection of a bishopric on the part of the Crown, without the formal assent of the Church, by no means implies any right of *suppressing* a bishopric which has been erected. The Crown's share in erecting these bishoprics was in making over the funds by which the bishops are supported; but these it gave in perpetuity, and has no right to resume them. Or should it in an evil hour for itself do even this, yet, in Mr. Manning's energetic words:—

“The consecrated overseer of Christ's flock still remains; no power can recall him, but that which gave his spiritual commission. The same hands that lengthened out the apostolic line, can alone break it off. Here is the mistake. Politicians treat bishoprics as a simple element, to be made or unmade by the omnipotence of Parliament. They do not remember that there are combined two elements, an earthly and a heavenly; two authorities, one of men and one of God. If the earthly and the human be removed, yet that which cannot be shaken,—the divine and heavenly authority,—must remain.”—*Letter*, pp. 26, 27.

The first Report, however, did not express *through whom* this solemn transfer was to take place; the difficulties which have prevented the assemblies of the inferior clergy, apply not to the meeting of the bishops, who, *until the period of this Commission*, did periodically and continually meet for those things which concerned the Church, at Queen-Anne's-Bounty Board. It was a virtual, though not a formal Synod. Then, also, the act itself seemed altogether more like a transfer than an extinction; all the members of the episcopal body were kept entire.—*It did not put out any one of the eyes, it did not remove a candlestick, of the Anglican Church.*

2. *It did not make the bishops stipendiaries*, or the payments from the richer to the poorer sees compulsory. The mode of providing for the poorer bishoprics which it proposed, was,—

“By *enabling* the future incumbents of the richer sees to transfer part of their estates to the poorer bishoprics, or to pay over annually a portion of their incomes to the governors of Queen Anne's Bounty, to be applied to the augmentation of such bishoprics; or either of these modes might be adopted, according to the particular circumstances of the case.”

* See authorities in Mr. Manning's Letter, pp. 25, 26. In Edward VI.'s time, Gloucester was for a while suppressed, through the greediness of the courtiers. *Burnet*, *ib.* “On the lowest ground,” says Mr. Manning, “our modern politicians who contend so vehemently for Tudor precedents in Church affairs, ought, at least, to abide by the same rule in constitutional questions; either to admit both or reject both. But precedents are our guides, only where no antecedent principles exist; we must in such cases gather our rule as best we may, by an induction of particular cases; but where principles have existed by an original ordinance, *contrary precedents are only breaches and violations.*”

There was no violence offered to property, or the rights of property, or the independence of the several sees, but only a proposed re-arrangement among the bishops themselves for what was supposed to be a benefit to the Church.

3. *There was no contemplation of the extinction of ONE prebend or canonry, but the contrary.* The Commission was issued thus far,—

“For considering the state of the several cathedral and collegiate churches within the same, with a view to the suggestion of such measures as may render *them* most conducive to the efficiency of the Established Church.”

The king in his Speech had used the same language:—

“I have appointed a Commission for considering the state of the several cathedral and collegiate churches, with a view to the suggestion of such measures as may render them most conducive to the efficiency of the Established Church.”

Accordingly, *this* Report, in conformity with the terms of the Commission and the Speech, mentioned two ways in which the prebends might promote this end, *by annexation*, 1st, to some of the poorer bishoprics, 2dly, to some of the more populous and destitute places, wherewith they were connected.

On the first point the Report says:—

“The most obvious mode of supplying the deficiency [in the whole amount of episcopal revenue, occasioned by the proposed grant of the episcopal impropriations, in whole or in part, to the respective parishes] will be, permanently to annex to some of the poorer bishoprics certain cathedral preferment; particularly in the chapters of St. Paul’s and Westminster, on account of their position in the metropolis.”

For the other, the very haste with which the vacancy of a prebendal stall of Westminster was seized upon to introduce the subject of the annexation of these stalls to large parishes, out of its regular course, the more illustrates the importance attached to this principle, and the effect expected from its announcement. Thanks were conveyed to his majesty for suspending the appointment to that stall; his “deepest interest in the successful prosecution of the Commission” announced; and some credit was evidently expected to be derived to the ministry, for not bestowing the nomination as a sinecure. Moreover, in the case thus seized upon, so far as related to the parish annexed, that of St. Margaret’s, Westminster, little or no actual alteration was made;*

* It was before *annexed* to the whole cathedral; the whole body of prebendaries was responsible for it, though, practically, the cure had, unhappily, been delegated to one prebendary; by this Report it was proposed permanently to annex it to one prebend, which is subdivided. “The parish contained, by the last census, 25,334;” (*Rep. I.*) so that as to real parochial cure nothing is gained. There can be no parochial superintendence now; whereas, had the prebend not been subdivided, but the

whence it the more appears, that the object of this anticipation was to bring out the principle upon which the new Commission purposed to proceed; it was to show that his majesty's government was intent on abolishing what had been made sinecures, and so promoting what would popularly be thought a reform.

Lastly, towards the conclusion of the Report, the Commissioners echo the terms of their appointment, and say,—

“ We shall forthwith take into our consideration, the present state of the several cathedrals and collegiate churches in England and Wales, with the view of submitting to your majesty some measures by which those foundations may be made more conducive than they now are, to the efficiency of the Established Church.”

Throughout, they are the “ foundations” themselves, not the *funds* of the foundations, the “ several cathedral and collegiate churches,” not “ money arising from the confiscation of their stalls and revenues,” whereby it was up to this time proposed, by his late majesty, by those who recommended the issuing of the Commission, and by those who acted in it, to benefit the Church.

4. *A sounder and more legitimate, and far more effectual, way of providing for spiritual wants was then in contemplation; viz. by means of the impropriations.* This is noticed in several parts of the Report. As an apology for uniting the two dioceses of St. Asaph and Bangor it is said:—

“ One advantage which will result from the union of these two sees will be, the opportunity afforded of applying a part of the impropriations, which constitute nearly the whole property of the bishoprics, to the augmentation of poor and populous vicarages in the united diocese.”

And again,—

“ A further diminution (in the future income of the bishoprics) is also to be expected from the application, *either in whole or in part*, of impropriations, which form a considerable portion of the incomes of many bishoprics, and which, in most instances, they were compelled to accept in exchange for manors and estates, for the improvement of populous and poorly endowed vicarages and curacies connected with them.”

5. Even in the wholly subordinate subject of patronage, they equally abstain from taking away a trust from those who had it, to give it to those to whom it had not been committed. Their recommendations on this point are plainly very scrupulous. They say,—

“ If your majesty shall be pleased to concur in the suggestion for erecting two new sees, it will, in our opinion, be expedient for the in-

prebendary required to keep a body of curates, enough might have been left to maintain a superior person at the head, and a good deal of parochial cure might have been obtained. In that case no principle would have been violated; but on what principle can a stall be subdivided?

terests of the Church, that the bishops of those sees shall possess a certain portion of patronage, in order that they may be enabled to reward deserving clergymen within their dioceses. For this purpose it will be necessary to transfer some advowsons to the bishops of the new sees.

"We do not propose that when a district is transferred from one diocese to another, the whole of the patronage within such district should likewise pass; but in many instances a partial transfer will be desirable."

This still maintained the character of an arrangement among the bishops themselves. A fuller consultation of the bishops would indeed have afforded a more definite recommendation; but such as it was, it was obviously a consequence of the re-distribution of their dioceses; when a bishop parted with a portion of his cure to another, it was natural that he should, in most cases, part with the subordinate appointments, the parochial benefices in that portion of his cure. This was in entire conformity with the original relation of the bishop and his clergy.

Such was the Conservative stage of the Commission, or (since it was shortly after broken up) one may say, such was the Conservative Commission. Its provisions were not satisfactory; they did not remedy, they scarcely palliated, the evils on the particular subject to which they applied; and it was a comfort that they did not even palliate them, since palliatives are more fatal than the diseases; they drive them in, where they work concealed, and so the more fatally. It was impossible that any scheme should even palliate the existing evils, which should attempt to portion out the population of England and Wales among twenty-four bishops, the same number which the Church had three centuries ago, when Westminster and Liverpool were villages; our manufacturing towns, commons; and Lancashire a moor.

The want of additional bishops was strongly felt by Bede* in 735, when there were seventeen bishoprics. Cranmer, when the population of England was but 4,400,000, wished to raise the number of sees to *sixty*, and herein he acted on the primitive model; and now, when the population must considerably exceed 14,000,000, to attempt to portion it out among bishops, only exceeding by one-third those of the time of Bede, must involve a manifest failure. The more equally you distribute 14,000,000 or 16,000,000 of souls among twenty-six bishops, the more completely will you efface the very notion of a bishopric, except for the purpose of transmitting the office to happier days, which may realize it. Accordingly the effect of these proposals, if

* Newman's *Suffragan Bishops*, p. 12, note.

carried into effect, would be, to efface our smaller bishoprics, which are a sort of witness what a bishopric ought more nearly to be, to bring the intermediate bishoprics to a medium stage of unsatisfactoriness, and, of our three portentous bishoprics, to leave two out of three. Thus, under the old state of things, there were eight bishoprics, St. Asaph, Bangor, Ely, Llandaff, Oxford, Peterborough, Rochester, Carlisle, with the cure of from 126,316 to 200,000 souls; two of these, St. Asaph and Bangor, are to be united, and these same bishoprics to range from 303,875 to 471,813. Formerly, at the other extreme, there were three bishoprics, whose several charges exceeded one million, one approached to two millions; now there are to be two bishoprics, London and Manchester, (whereof London alone, if distributed among three, a bishop of London, of Westminster, and of Southwark, would have furnished three over-large bishoprics,) each with a population of above a million. Little, then, which could be called good, would be effected by this change, and the return to a better system delayed, but for the existence of those two great bishoprics, of London and Manchester, which obviously demanded a further remedy. Meantime, however, much evil was done. Evil was done by making changes which themselves required other corrective changes; evil was done by effacing the smaller bishoprics, and thus accustoming persons to a lower degree of episcopal superintendence, and pastoral care; to do, and act, and live more, without bishops; to make bishops mere commissioners,

“The functionaries of statutes, the administrators of oaths, the agents of correspondence about the building of churches, the management of societies, and the serving of tables;”*

instead of

“Living among their people, having the custody of the Christian Faith in their own place and day, and by their lives and conversation impressing it in all its saving fullness of doctrine and precept upon the face of society, the centres and emblems of Christian unity, the bonds of many minds, and the mementos of Him who is unseen.”

In this way, also, evil was done by the unnecessary severing of dioceses, distributing dioceses into arrondissemens, counting human souls like a flock of sheep, to be penned within a certain space, and so breaking through long attachments, and recollections, and associations: paring off from one diocese and adding to another, as if they could transfer affections, as they could square miles, or make feelings flow as they drew the lines upon a

* Newman's *Suffragan Bishops*, p. 17.

map. It is the misfortune of persons who are the objects of affection or respect, that they often know not the reverence in which their office or their relation is held, even when little is known of their persons. The aristocracy have often thoughtlessly, in mere ignorance, worn out, or snapped, these bands which were meant to unite their dependents with themselves, and through them, bind up in one peaceful union the whole national family. They knew not the feelings, because they lay unexpressed till the occasion shall call them forth, or their expression was mistaken. The Commission made the like mistake in rounding dioceses, transferring portions of counties from one diocese to another; treating ecclesiastical England, as if it were now for the first time to be apportioned among twenty-six bishoprics, instead of regarding actual ties, feelings, and habits. The line which marks the bounds of a county is generally capricious; yet even among the falsely refined, that invisible bond exercises a power over them, which they acknowledge more or less in action, even while in theory they would disclaim it; charity would flow more freely on their own side of the invisible border; the poor within it are felt somehow more to belong to them; how much more power would the tie have over the simple-minded children of a Christian Church! The unity then of the dioceses ought not to have been needlessly broken; rather, when necessary, should a diocese have been divided into two or more integral portions, not the "*disjecta membra*" of one diocese scattered among several, as if broken limbs would cement speedily into the fair proportions of one compacted body.

This principle was not felt, and so was again and again needlessly violated. The arrangements were made with a rough hand. For instance, to what end to sever the north-west corner of Wiltshire (the deaneries of Malmsbury and Cricklade) from the diocese of Salisbury, to which the rest of the county belongs, and join it on to Gloucester? or, again, even more minutely, to detach certain *parishes* of the county of Worcester and attach them to Gloucester, to whose diocesan seat they are not even so near as to that in their own diocese and county? and this two-fold change did but approximate the diocese of Gloucester to the average population of bishoprics, by adding to it about 48,000, raising it from 275,806 to 324,198. Such changes are not effected without doing violence to many feelings; nor do parts thus joined coalesce at the fiat of a commission. The county of

* Half of this plan has since been abandoned; that which related to Salisbury persisted in, against the wishes, it is understood, of the clergy at least, and of their bishop. The same vicious principle runs through all the Reports; and when it is abandoned in detail in the one case, it is committed anew in another.

Berks, from long habit associated in diocesan charities with that of Wiltshire, and looked upon itself as one diocese with it; joined on to the diocese of Oxford, the old diocese and the new addition are two distinct bodies under one head. They have no feeling of unity. Much more would this be the case should the county of Bucks be added on the other side. It would be, not a triple-headed but a triple-bodied monster. Instead of this petty joining on and taking-off, this adding and subtracting and squaring of sees, this so-called "equalizing" of dioceses, whereby the largest (London) was still to be just eight times the size of what, on the new regime, was to be the smallest (Hereford) and the "equalized" bishoprics were to vary from 218,392 to 1,746,504, with a difference of above 1,500,000, a more courageous, and therefore a wiser policy, would have kept unimpaired the smaller bishoprics, and boldly proposed a plan to remedy the deficiencies of the larger. A plan which should have at least divided Lincoln, Exeter, and Winchester, into two; London, York, and Lichfield and Coventry, into three, or given them this proportion of suffragan bishops; and Chester into four, would have commanded respect; and the moral courage exerted in making it would have overawed discontent, even in quarters where the manifest necessity of the proposal did not put opposition to shame. Men, who would have proposed this, would have been seen to be in earnest about remedying our ecclesiastical deficiencies, and probably, no very serious difficulty would have been raised by the opponents of the Church; these could not appreciate the spiritual change of investing a dean with the office of a bishop;* they could only estimate votes in the House of Lords. Report said, that a timid policy among the Conservative party prevented it; for fear that the precedent of bishops out of parliament should lead to the expulsion of the rest. This has no real ground; for the bishops are temporal barons; the new bishops would not have been; but such timidity is inconsistent with the character of a re-former, or renewer, or restorer of the Church. The single opening sentence then of the Report, "We are not prepared to recommend any increase in the total number of episcopal sees," dissipated every hope of amendment. Nothing but the increase of the "total number of bishoprics" would afford any real remedy; the plan proposed might disguise in some respects the extent of

* At the same time that Mr. Newman's interesting pamphlet appeared on the general subject, a sketch of a specific plan for relieving our bishops, by the same means, was drawn by a different hand, in the *British Magazine*, March, 1835, for which, however, there were not then adequate materials, since the Report of Ecclesiastical Revenues had not been published.

the evil, by reducing the more privileged, more nearly to the condition of the less privileged, dioceses;* but it could not remove the necessity of further change. The English Church, heretofore, had increased her bishoprics in proportion to the increase of her population; this principle of our Church was, for the first time, abandoned, and extensive changes were made, and all the evils of unsettlement incurred, although these changes must be again changed, if any real improvement was ever to be made, or our Church ever to enjoy fully her birthright of Episcopal superintendence. It was, too, evil, and of evil precedent, that the clergy of the dioceses of Bangor and St. Asaph were tempted, willingly to resign one of their bishops, and to choose a condition spiritually less advantageous, by the bribe of the prospect of an improvement to their benefices. The Report proposed—

“That the Sees of St. Asaph and Bangor should be united;—one advantage which will result from the union of these two sees will be the opportunity afforded of applying a part of the impropriations, which constitute nearly the whole property of the bishoprics, to the augmentation of poor and populous vicarages in the united diocese.”

Harm then was done in the direct proposals of this first Report, in that change was introduced, without any real benefit, and change contrary to the former character of our Church, and violating old attachments and relations. Still, this Report, though disadvantageous in detail, violated no great principles,† and in every important principle differed from its successors, in that—1. it extinguished altogether no bishopric; 2. invaded no rights of property; 3. maintained the independence of the bishops; 4. proposed to preserve the chapters; 5. was guarded even as to the trusts of patronage; 6. was in the right, and safe, and old way of providing for spiritual wants by the ecclesiastical impropriations and annexation; 7. it implied or recommended no

* The following table shows the relative size of our bishoprics, as they were, and as they are to be remodelled :—

	old.	new.
Above 100,000 souls and below 200,000	8	0
200,000 ————— 300,000	4	2
300,000 ————— 400,000	3	8
400,000 ————— 500,000	3	7
500,000 ————— 600,000	0	4
600,000 ————— 700,000	1	1
700,000 ————— 800,000	2	2
800,000 ————— 900,000	1	0
900,000 ————— 1,000,000	1	0
1,000,000 and upwards	3	2

† Except in what related not to the subject of the Report, the hasty sub-division of the stall of Westminster, which (even if the right existed anywhere) none but the chapter, or the whole Church, had a right to do.

permanent board with a majority of laymen to decide in ecclesiastical affairs; 8, in a word, *it maintained all our old institutions, rights, trusts, foundations, and the oaths and adjurations whereby they are guarded, inviolate and inviolable, and adapted only ancient institutions to ends which were in part, at least, contemplated by their founders.*

With regard to the principle of annexation, although, if carried to too great an extent, it would destroy many of the purposes of cathedral institutions, yet, on any judicious and matured system, it would be but carrying out, on a regular plan, what exists already. It would produce no organic change in the constitution of our Church.

This Commission expired with the administration of Sir R. Peel. That statesman had made the mistake not unfrequent with his complexion of policy; he had proposed alterations, about which people cared not, and thereby hoped to be able to withhold those about which men anxious for change cared. These cared not whether we had three or two dioceses exceeding 1,000,000 souls; they had listened with satisfaction, as an argument for extinguishing ten sees in Ireland, that an English metropolitan could discharge the duties of a diocese containing a million and a half of souls; they cared not, in reality, whether we had sinecures or not—the clamour, as far as it existed, was meant to obtain their confiscation, not their employment; they wished not to equalize bishoprics, but to equalize sects with the Church; their idol was power and wealth; and alterations which gave them neither, had no interest for them. But Sir R. Peel opened a door which he could not close; he had established a principle, that there should be extensive change, even though in his case the change was not unprincipled, or without principles; yet the question, that there shall be change, once established, it is an easy transition from *change of some sort* to *change of any sort*. Sir R. Peel is not to be blamed that he was obliged to leave his work unfinished, and allow it to pass into other hands, wherein it should be carried on very differently; this was the result of past compromise. What he is to be blamed for was, the undue prominence which he gave to the measure of so-called church-reform; the haste with which it was hurried on; the appetite for change which he called forth, and, (which was the ground-work of all these) the employment (it may be unconsciously) of alterations in the Church as a means of increasing the stability of a secular party, or the mistaking the Church for a secular body. He thus loosened the confidence, which the lapse of a few years had begun a little to restore; agitated and perplexed the minds of those in whom the real strength of his line of politics lies; and

the Church having been made subservient to secular politics, was destined to suffer.

The new Commission was issued June 6, 1835, in the same terms as the preceding, only that five Whig politicians were substituted for the four Conservative, thereby showing the intention of the new ministry to make the Commission an instrument of power, and to maintain their authority in it. The ascendancy of laymen over the bishops was now as eight to five.

No immediate political end being now to be gained by any extraordinary celerity, the Second Report did not appear until about a year after the first. It bears date March 4, 1836, and was laid before Parliament March 10. The year which had elapsed, however, instead of maturing the views of the Commissioners, had unsettled them: within a year the whole face of things, and the prospects of the Church, were changed.

The Commission was re-issued in terms the same as before, but the second Report, in part, went *beyond* the objects of the Commission, recommending what its terms no ways authorized, *in part, went in direct contravention to those very terms.*

The gravest instance in which the second Report exceeded the Commission, was the wanton destruction of the ancient bishopric of Sodor and Mann.

"We are of opinion, also," it says, "that the bishopric of Sodor and Mann may, without inconvenience, be united to that of Carlisle, as the Isle of Mann contains only eighteen parishes; over which the archdeacon, who is resident, and has a respectable income, can exercise an effectual superintendence."

As if it were, *per se*, a good, that a bishopric should be suppressed, if it could be done "without inconvenience," for no positive ground is alleged; and the Episcopal office does indeed seem to be lightly appreciated, since the superintendence of an archdeacon is placed on a level with it; as if the one were as "effectual," and as holy, and as apostolic, as the other! To suppress a bishopric by the secular arm, and to compare the "superintendence" of an archdeacon with that of a bishop, are certainly in keeping. Setting this aside, however, it clearly exceeded their commission. The Commission did not entitle them to consider the state of the Isle of Mann at all, but only that of the dioceses of England and Wales; Mann is a separate branch of the Church, with a separate jurisdiction and legislature; and even with regard to English bishoprics, the objects of inquiry proposed were "the amount of their revenues, the more equal

distribution of episcopal duties, and the prevention of attaching, by commendam, to bishoprics *benefices with the cure of souls*," not the extinction of a bishopric, or (to use a mild term) that a bishopric should be held *in commendam*, in order that a deanery might not be. The same Report set aside the objections of the Bishop of Winchester to the severance of his suburban districts and their annexation to the see of London, on account of "the advantages of placing the metropolis and the suburban parishes under one jurisdiction." We confess we see not the advantage of placing under one bishop above 1,700,000 people, connected together by no bond, except the common boundary of the Reform Bill;* yet, when this was felt to be so great a convenience, it seems strange that it should have seemed no "inconvenience" to join on an island to another diocese from which it is separated by a stormy sea, during the winter months impassable. The gratuitousness of this destruction of an ancient see, the utilitarianism of destroying a see because there was "no inconvenience," and the disregard to rights of property, which would have taken from Mann its "ewe lamb," in order to spare the flocks and herds of its wealthier neighbour, eking out the bishoprics of England and Wales by the £2000 per annum taken from Mann,† would, in itself, imply that other influences were predominant in the Commission, or that at least the presence of its new elements had transmuted the character of those who had been left in it. And the change implied by this arbitrary act is the more remarkable, in that this annexation was first proposed when Sir R. Peel was in office, in order to add the bishop's income to Carlisle, but the measure was then successfully opposed, as being *unjust*, if the revenues were alienated from the soil, and *useless*, if they were not.

The extinction of the diocese of Mann was unjustifiable on every principle of honesty, generosity, and ecclesiastical polity; it was an Erastian act, oppressing and spoiling a weaker neighbour; it re-enacted the abolition of the Irish sees, and made the English Church the spoiler. It was, however, from the nature of the case, a single instance.

Far more extensive was the case of *direct contravention to the terms of the Commission*. The Commission runs—"for considering the state of the several cathedral and collegiate churches in England and Wales, with a view to the suggestion of such measures as may render *them* most conducive to the efficiency of

* "In assigning the boundaries of the diocese, we have adopted those fixed by an act passed in the 4th and 5th years of your majesty's reign, as comprising the metropolitan district." Many decided *disadvantages*, besides that of the vastness of the change, are well pointed out by Mr. Benson, Letter, p. 13, *sqq.*

† Letter by the late Bishop Ward to the Clergy of the Isle of Mann, Nov. 1837, p. 3.

the Established Church;" the king's Speech, as said above, pressed the same point, "to render *them*," the cathedral and collegiate churches, "most conducive;" the former Commissioners stated that they were preparing to consider this, and began, in the case of Westminster, acting upon it. The Second Commission recited the same words, and then proceeded to speak, not of the cathedrals, but of their *endowments*; to propose to render *them*, the cathedrals, "more conducive to the efficiency of the Church" by well-nigh destroying them, by abolishing at one stroke, "above 360 non-residentiary prebends, and 72, or nearly one-half of the residentiaries; to render, *e. g.* Canterbury, or Westminster, or Winchester, or Durham, more efficient, by taking away two-thirds of their residentiaries, suppressing eight out of twelve prebends. Suppress the rest, and blot out (as would soon be done) all but the memory of our cathedrals, what they did for the Church so long as politicians meddled not with them, either to corrupt or to destroy them, and you will have brought them to the very acmé of efficiency. The Commissioners seem to have borrowed a hint from the treacherous act of Medea, when she cut in pieces the aged king, limb from limb, and seethed him, and boiled up his flesh, in order to restore him to the freshness and vigour of youth.

The contradiction between the directions given by his late Majesty and this Report of the Commissioners is so obvious, that it seems strange that they should even have thought themselves entitled to enter upon the question at all,* but that the influence of a strong bias is proverbial. Under such, the Commissioners honestly confess themselves to have acted. They admit

"We have entered upon the inquiry, which relates to cathedral and collegiate churches, under a *strong impression* that if the endowments of those bodies should appear to be larger than is requisite for the purposes of their institution, and for maintaining them in such a state of efficiency and respectability, as may enable them fully to carry those purposes into effect, the surplus of those endowments, whatever it may be, ought to be made available for the augmentation of poor benefices containing a large population, and to the great object of adding to the number of the parochial clergy."

* It is curious to observe the way in which the Commissioners gradually change the language of the Commission in respect to the cathedrals; the Commission runs, "such measures as may render them *most conducive* to the efficiency of the Established Church," Report I. changes this (towards the close) into "by which those foundations may be made *more conducive than they now are*," &c.; but Report II. actually quotes his Majesty's words, "as may render them conducive," omitting "*most*," p. 5. The original wording cannot be acquitted of utilitarianism, as if the inquiry were altogether open, and cathedrals might be turned to account in any way which seemed expedient; but as the views of the Commissioners altered, even it was modified.

In other words, they entered upon this inquiry, not for the purpose of ascertaining whether the cathedral churches might be preserved and rendered effective for the ends which they and we have at heart,—not with any respect for the piety of their founders, or their past services, or the sacredness of trusts, or the rights of property, or the vested interests of posterity,—not with any enlarged views as to the efficiency of the Established Church, nor whether such efficiency might not be promoted in the highest degree, by these offices, if *well filled* (and for the mode in which they *have been* filled, persons in the offices of the Commissioners are accountable to the Church, and to God), nor whether it is not necessary to the healthy existence of the Church, to have such offices, nor whether she ever was without them in some form, nor (to name one point more) whether, on the narrow view which makes parochial ministers the measure of the wants of the Church, a judicious system of annexation of important cures to a certain number of these offices, might not be at least as beneficial as the melting them down into one common fund, (for even if it were only as beneficial, the most ordinary principles of sound policy would require them to be left untouched)—the Commissioners entered upon the inquiry, as they state, not with any of these views, but under the one “strong impression,” that if the cathedrals had any thing to spare, they had a right to take it; “it ought to be made available for the augmentation of poor benefices containing a large population, and to the great object of adding to the number of the parochial clergy.” The cathedral and collegiate churches may well appeal from, the Church may well mistrust, such biassed and prejudiced inquiries!

The inquiry, consequently, was soon settled. Three cathedrals were found, all in towns of small population, York, Chichester, and Carlisle, which had but a dean and four canons; therewith the “inquiry” was accomplished; a satisfactory minimum was found, by which the rest might be measured and reduced; the commissioners recommend, with apparent satisfaction,

“that the chapter in each of the churches enumerated, shall consist hereafter of a dean and four canons, the establishment at present *actually existing* in the cathedrals of York, Chichester, and Carlisle; and that the income which would have been payable to each residentiary, exceeding the number of four, shall, as the stalls become vacant, be paid to the treasurer of Queen Anne’s Bounty.”

And so, because, in ancient times, in the cathedrals in small towns, York and Chichester, all but four were allowed to be non-residents, no attention is to be paid to the will of the founder of

Wells,* who requires that the smallest number of residents should be six; or because at the Reformation 3500*l.* per annum alone was rescued out of the spoils of the monasteries, for the cathedral of the small city and diocese of Carlisle, therefore the metropolitan cathedral of Canterbury; or the chapter of Westminster, in the heart of our destitute and crowded capital; or Exeter, the capital of the West; or Durham, the seat of an university; or Ely, naturally and historically, and by grateful recollections connected with one, and fruitful in learned men, are to be reduced to the same level: or because in the small city of Carlisle, a somewhat larger income is divided among its residentiaries, than in the populous and important city of Bristol is distributed among six, therefore Carlisle is to retain its endowments, Bristol is to lose *two* of its stalls, and their endowments to be carried elsewhere; and though Carlisle is to retain its endowment, such as it is, Hereford, Salisbury, Bristol, Gloucester, Peterborough, because their founders wished their service to be more solemn, and their number of residentiaries larger, are all to be reduced to the same number as Carlisle, and their aggregate incomes considerably below it.† We do not wish to set up Carlisle as the ideal of income as well as of numbers, lest it should be the signal for fresh spoliation, such as has been spoken of; but we do contend that it is an injustice to these cities to carry their income elsewhere; and that, although Bristol, Gloucester, and Salisbury have large and ill-endowed cures, whereas had their founders divided them into the “perfect number” of four, they would still have retained it. Again, of those who attempted to realize in their institutions the number of the Apostles, and would have the very number of the residentiaries be a memento of an apostolic life, Winchester and Canterbury will be despoiled of two-thirds of their prebendaries and (the dean being for the present retained) of four-sevenths of their revenues, whereas, had the founders been less nobly ambitious in the institutions which they consecrated “to the honour of the holy and undivided Trinity,” and prescribed but six instead of twelve prebendaries, they would have been mutilated of one-third only. Again, if separate estates were left to any particular stall, such was the love of equality in

* Memorial of the Dean and Chapter of Wells.—*Chapter Memorials*, p. 137.

† “The rule which has been actually adopted must operate unequally, because whatever be the amount of chapter endowments, and whatever be its wants, without the least reference to either the one point or the other, the portion to be abstracted is made to depend simply on the number of shares into which cathedral funds have in fact been divided; so that, assuming two cathedrals with equal revenues, if in the one, eight residentiaries had been found necessary, and had been maintained, and in the other four only, from the more efficient chapter half its means would be abstracted, and from the other nothing.”—*Exeter Memorial*, l. c. p. 86.

these Commissioners, (with the exception of two cases "reserved for further consideration,") that they were all taken away; even Chichester, with its four residentiaries, did not reach the ideal of perfection since it had separate estates amounting to 109*l.* per annum! and so, by the (we will not use a hard term, but the Commissioners' own) by the *abstraction** of the separate estates, it yielded 109*l.* per annum to "the fund." Happy, or as it is termed in minstrelsy "merry Carlisle" alone realized its ancient character, and remained unmutilated. Procrustes was wont to be a proverb for tyrannical proceeding; yet even he, when he stretched out or amputated the limbs of the travellers, as they fell short of, or exceeded his ideal, chose a medium standard; in these recommendations, almost the whole process is amputation.

But if in this point these second Commissioners went beyond their measure and against their instructions, in one closely connected with it they fell short of it, we mean in "Inquiry." They were directed, as they recite the terms of their Commission, to "consider the state of the Cathedral and Collegiate Churches of England and Wales." As they interpreted the former instructions over-laxly, so these over-narrowly. Terms, such as these, could hardly be construed to mean that they were to look into the returns of the former Commission, which in their first Report they designate as inadequate;† examine *them* on the state of each Cathedral; see what funds were divided among its residentiaries; whether it had any non-residentiaries; what separate estates any of its members held; what might be confiscated to the general fund. It surely implied a particular inquiry into the local circumstances of each several cathedral; its relation to the city or the diocese in which it was placed; what ends it might serve relatively to those for whom it was more immediately endowed, at least the sources of its revenues; and what it owed to such places, or how it might more especially benefit those where-with it was connected. It is plain that no such inquiry was made, even for this, that as it would have been impossible that, upon inquiry, the same unbending measure of confiscation should have been applied to all, all have been mown down to one common level. The Commissioners could not so have ignored all the information which inquiry would have furnished. But, besides, it is notorious (*and we have full reason to know*) that no inquiry was

* "Abstraction, the act of taking away one thing from another."—*Johnson's Dict.*

† "As the greater part of the Episcopal revenues arises from fines on the renewal of leases, of which some were granted for three lives, renewable when a life drops, and others for twenty-one years, renewable every seven, and in towns for forty years, renewable every fourteen, it is manifest that a period of three years is too short to exhibit a correct average of the annual value of the several sees."—*Report 1, p. 5.*

made;* that information offered was refused; that representations were left unanswered; that no one member of a cathedral (we speak not of one who, being a bishop, was on the Commission) *no one member of a cathedral was examined, heard, or listened to.* The recommendations for the suppression of stalls, which, by the terms of the Commission, they were not empowered to make, was founded on the entire neglect of inquiry, which was the very professed object of their appointment.

Yet the Commissioners felt that they ought, by the terms of their appointment, to have made such inquiries; they admit that they ought, and they profess that they had made them, nay, and “particular inquiries.” They say,

“Having made particular inquiries concerning the constitution of these several foundations, the establishments mentioned in each, the revenues of the corporations and of their individual members, and the disposition of their corporate funds, we are now prepared to recommend such measures, as will, in our opinion, leave a sufficient provision for the proper performance of the service of the Churches, for the continual reparation and maintenance of the fabrics, and *for the other objects contemplated by the founders*, and at the same time allow the application of a considerable portion of their revenues to, &c.”

But these “particular inquiries” extended no further than into the large Report, printed by the previous “Commission of Inquiry into Ecclesiastical Revenues,” or a condensation of the statements made to them. The Appendixes, Nos. 4, 5, 6, 7, to which they refer in proof of their “particular inquiries,” contain no other data than what had been furnished before by a different body, re-arranged. Yet they too had been armed with the same power of examining upon oath, if required, “any rolls, records, orders, books, papers, or other writings relating to the said cathedral and collegiate churches;” so that the advisers of this Commission contemplated no such summary process as that adopted. Such inquiry would have prevented much evil. The Commissioners declared their wish to

“leave a sufficient provision for the proper performance of the services of the churches;”

and the chapter of Carlisle, the model cathedral, would have told them that

“they feel it their duty to state that they cannot contemplate with any degree of satisfaction, the proposal for reducing the number of canons in other more richly-endowed cathedrals to the number of four, *fixed by their own statutes*; because they are, from experience, well aware that

* This is complained of in the Memorial of Canterbury (p. 38), Exeter (p. 92), Lincoln (p. 107), Salisbury (p. 128). The chapter of Wells offers information (p. 137). Others (*e. g.* Exeter) give a good deal which was not attended to.

with that limited number it is very difficult, and often impracticable, to secure the constant attendance of one of the body at daily prayer, more especially when sickness or old age may happen to prevent individuals from fulfilling their own wishes in that respect."—*Chapter Memorials*, p. 24.

Canterbury again would have stated that

"we ourselves have had at the same time four prebendaries, of whom three were more than seventy years old, two of them more than eighty, and one so much an invalid that he was seldom equal to his duty; what would have been said of our 'efficiency,' if our number had been limited to those four? If we look to those cathedrals in which the number of prebendaries is four, we find that a system of proxies has been there introduced and tolerated; but the system has given rise to much calumny against cathedral institutions, even where use has rendered it familiar; and we may reasonably infer that the introduction of it at the present day, would more seriously affect the credit of chapters, whose members have been studious and careful to give their personal attendance."—*Ib.* p. 12.

Exeter, that

"in the discharge of the many and important public duties which their position in the diocese and the city brings upon them, it is the presence and co-operation of two or more canons, which alone could enable them to act with the necessary promptitude and decision."—*Ib.* p. 77.

Exeter, which is among the most efficient and well-conducted cathedrals in the Church, attests that it owes that efficiency to the constant residence of two or more of its prebendaries, as opposed to the modern lax system, which in consequence of these preferments being held with distant cures, too often, but not uniformly prevails, that one only should reside at once. This modern innovation the Commission took as its standard.

Ely again, that

"in compliance with the strong injunction of their statutes, they are in the constant habit of preaching to a very large congregation assembled in the body of the cathedral church. In cases of sickness and infirmity, it has been the custom for one member of the chapter to take another's duty, so that there are very few Sundays in the year when the pulpit is not occupied by the lord bishop of the diocese, the dean, or some member of the chapter; but that they are convinced that it would not be possible to maintain this part of the service upon its present footing, if the number of canons were reduced to four."

And after protesting against the inference from York and Chester, in which non-residentiaries perform a part of the duty, they maintain—

"that should the proposed reduction ever take place, it would most seriously impair the dignity, solemnity, and efficiency of those religious offices, which were ordained by their founder to be performed for ever

in the cathedral church of Ely, to the glory of Almighty God, and the welfare of the people."

The like is urged by the chapters of Westminster, Windsor, and Hereford; and in another chapter, with which we happen to be acquainted, consisting of six prebendaries, two of whom have from ill health long been incapacitated from residing, how would the service be provided for, if these two shall be part of the reduced number of four? This office is in the large majority of cases retained for life, and yet it is one, which, in case of the infirmities of the holders, cannot, like parochial duties, be supplied by a curate. And therefore, perhaps, among other reasons, the founders did not fix the minimum which modern "equalizing" would adopt.

Again, the Commissioners profess to wish
"to leave enough for the reparation and continual maintenance of the fabric."

On this again the chapter of Salisbury would have informed them,

"that to provide for the frequent and costly repairs of their venerable cathedral, they had hitherto subjected themselves to a deduction from their annual dividends, by appropriating one-eighth to the express purpose of maintaining it in its original beauty and elegance."—*ib.* p. 132.

The chapter of Norwich and of Christ-Church, insist upon the same point; and it were manifest, on reflection, that when the maxim should be once established, that cathedrals become "conducive to the efficiency of the Established Church" in proportion to the sums which they yield towards parochial purposes, any sums to be spent upon the maintenance of the fabric, would be first grudged, then clamoured against, then refused. Would the chapter of Canterbury have been allowed to pledge its income in order to borrow £2,000*l.* for the restoration of their beautiful fabric? Would it not have been said, (it has indeed been already said,) "Wherefore this waste? This ointment might have been sold for much and given to the poor." The principle of magnificent honouring of God, which thinks nothing too costly for His service Who gave us all, and our modern utilitarianism, are directly opposed to each other. So soon as the utilitarian principle shall be applied to cathedrals, their days are numbered; this very plea of their expensiveness has been already urged in the House of Commons,* as a ground for pulling them down, and the proposal was heard unrebuked. The same proposal was made in times which have too many points of resemblance with the present.

* By Mr. Hume.

“On* the Journals may be read the following entry (9th July, 1652.)

“That it be referred to the committee to consider what cathedrals are fit to stand, and what to be pulled down, and what part thereof; and how those cathedrals, or such part thereof, as shall be pulled down shall be applied to the payment of the public faith.”

It was discovered then, we believe, that the expense of pulling down these massive monuments of piety would cost more than the value of the materials, when the desolation was accomplished; and so since nothing could be obtained to relieve “the public faith,” our cathedrals were allowed to stand; but time and decay are costless labourers; and it is certain that after about two-thirds of the property of a chapter has been confiscated, two-thirds would not be paid out of “the fund” resulting from the confiscations, towards any repairs of the cathedral. No! it would now become, what its founders made it to other ends, *sacrosanct*; the spoils would be regarded as the property of the parochial clergy: the remnants of the chapters might support their cathedrals, if they would, with their whole income; else a sure but heavy hand would moulder them, and after-generations would admire the ruins of Ely and Lincoln, as they do those of Tintern and Melrose; taking credit to themselves for their sympathy and taste in admiring what their penury destroyed. The state of the once beautiful cathedrals of Normandy show what will be the effects of this “abstraction” of their funds.

Lastly, the Commissioners wish, they say,

“To leave a sufficient provision for the other objects contemplated by their founders.”

Here, again, inquiry would have saved what is of all the most painful, and which, considering the character and office of the Episcopal Commissioners, one least likes to touch upon. Yet the first object, that which the founders seem most prominently to have contemplated, was the inviolability of their institutions. This is just what one would suppose that a founder would contemplate; he might think that in varying times, his institution might require various subordinate modifications, (though even these he would have used sparingly, lest his institution should be made to fall in with bad times, instead of being a witness against them,) but that which founders would naturally have at heart would be, that their institutions should remain, as monuments of them; that they should, after their death, remain to carry on their designs; that they themselves should thus work on after death; that as long as the militant state of Christ’s Church should endure, their

* Prospects of England, June, 1832, an able pamphlet.

gifts and labours should be employed in the good fight. They were contented to lay the foundation of fabrics, which, while on earth, they should never see; they were content with a posthumous joy; they parted with the present, that they might gain futurity. They lived in futurity, and parting with what could be realized during life, for that which could not be completed till after life, they wished to have the whole period after their life as theirs. They wished, blending their names or their works with His, "Who alone endureth for ever," to acquire an immortality for their works, to yield an immortality of service; "they called" not "their lands after their own names," but after His, and so they hoped, that, with His, their "name also should endure for ever, their names should remain under the sun among the posterities," who (in their subordinate way) "should be blessed through them, while generation after generation, through their institutions, praised their God."

Such is the obvious wish of a founder, the integrity and inviolability of his institutions; and such the chapters would, upon inquiry, have informed them, was the expressed wish of *their* founders, and that consequently whatever additional duties might be laid upon them, it must be a first principle that the institution should remain unimpaired. The Cathedral of Ely (and their statutes are the same as many, if not all, and are the expositors of all) would have told them, that the will of their founder, as recorded in their statutes, was*—

"To the glory and honour of the Holy and Undivided Trinity, we have decreed that a certain cathedral church, consisting of one dean, a presbyter, and eight prebendaries, presbyters, should be created, erected, founded, and established, *there* to serve Almighty God wholly *and for ever*; and this same cathedral church, consisting of one dean, a presbyter, and eight prebendaries, presbyters, with other ministers necessary for the worship of God, we do by the tenor of these presents really and fully create, erect, found, establish, and do by these presents command to be established and kept *inviolably for ever*; and the said dean and prebendaries we do in name and reality make, create, and establish, into one corporate body, and do make, declare, ordain and hold them as one body, and let them have a *perpetual succession*."

It was surely a part of "the constitution of these several foundations," into which the Commissioners acknowledged it to be their duty to inquire, that they *were constituted for ever*.

The more miserable part, however, remains. The several

* We cannot, of course, look upon Henry VIII. or Elizabeth as the founders of cathedrals, which they only re-erected on the basis of similar foundations, abstaining thus far from gratifying the avarice of their courtiers; but their statutes may be looked upon as embodying the wishes of the ancient and real founders, to which these gave a civil and royal sanction.

bishops on the commission had, by themselves, or by proxy, taken the oath prescribed in their charters, that they would maintain the "rights" of the said churches. Such oaths are in tranquil times often apt to be forgotten, from the very fact, that he who takes them thinks it impossible that he *can* violate them. Had inquiry been employed, they would have been reminded that the oath bound them, not only as to any thing which they could do in their individual capacity, which is nothing, but as legislators; that they are, as they have often since been quietly and respectfully reminded, "the sworn defenders of the cathedrals," and must not, in any way, lay their hand upon them; that they may reform abuses, if any exist, but may not, under a plea of reconstructing, destroy.

The Chapter of Canterbury * would have recalled to them, had it been allowed to speak, that—

"The care, indeed, taken of our 'rights and liberties' thus ordained, is singularly manifested in the oath which our diocesans take on their inthronization, and which binds them absolutely to maintain our rights and liberties, while it exacts but a conditional observance of our customs; for the words of the oath are, 'I swear to maintain the rights and liberties of this church, and to observe the approved customs thereof, and, as far as it concerns the archbishop, to cause the same to be observed by others, so far as such customs are not repugnant to God's word, the laws, statutes, provisions and ordinances of the realm, or to his majesty's prerogative, and not otherwise.' The language in the cap. 6 of our statutes sets forth the founder's will without any ambiguity:—'We wholly forbid the alienation or impledging of any manor, &c., for we wish our church to be in good condition, not to grow lean' (*pinguescere, non macrescere*).

"The oath prescribed in cap. 11 of our statutes, and taken by every prebendary on his admission, contains the founder's will, expressed, if possible, still more strongly.—Since, then, it is apparent that our founder has not only given to us the disposal and enjoyment of all our revenues, and by every kind of ordinance secured them to us absolutely, and without deduction for any purpose foreign to our establishment, save of one specific payment in lieu of first fruits and tenths, but that he has also confined the revenues to us, excluding all others from participating in them, and that he binds every individual member, by the strongest and most sacred ties, to resist, to the utmost of his power, all attempts that may be made to alienate or divert any portion of them, we maintain that no alienation of our revenues can be enforced by the Commissioners, without violating as well all the generally received rights of property, as the rights and liberties which are peculiarly ours."

We cannot doubt, that this consideration, which is again strongly urged in the memorial of Ely, hinted at in that of Here-

* Memorial, l. c. p. 9.

ford and others, and conveyed in the common memorial of the delegates of chapters, would have influenced the episcopal members of the Commission; that even if they could satisfy themselves that their oath might be confined to their individual capacities (in which it now means nothing), still it would commonly be thought that an oath taken by one, *as* bishop, and on his inthronization *as* bishop, must bind him in all his episcopal functions; that great scandal would consequently be given, and great laxity as to oaths encouraged, did *they* become the very causes of destroying or impairing, did *they* recommend, and legislate, and vote for, impairing that, which they had sworn to maintain inviolate. As it was, there were no means of conveying this information to them, until the first act had been done; there was no sufficient ground (in the face of the opposite recommendation of the Commission and the first Report, as corresponding with the Commission) to suspect that any such plan was even contemplated; the Commissioners then could not but remain unwarned; they recommended these measures against the cathedrals, we are assured, unaware of their oath; the second step they have not yet taken; they have not retracted, but neither have they advanced. We are sure, could the matter have been presented to them, *re integra*, they would have seen that any confiscation of revenues was precluded to them individually, as well as by the terms of the Commission; that if it was done at all, it must be done by other hands, that *to them*, annexation of duty, or some plan which should maintain each cathedral entire and inviolate, was the only way open, whereby to make the cathedrals "most conducive to the efficiency of the Church."

In the absence, however, of all inquiry, save into the amount of the endowments of the several cathedrals, and the numbers to whom those endowments had been allotted, the process was necessarily short. The only principle of this Report and this Commission was (in its own language) to "obtain what resources" it could, for an end, good in itself, but not, if pursued by means not good, nor, in such way, likely to be blessed. Its characteristic is an utter disregard of all ancient rights and usages and laws, a forgetfulness of times past. Riveted on the present, and present needs, every thing else disappears from the sphere of their vision, but this only, how this money, or some portion of this money, may be "obtained;—rem, si possis, recte, si non, quocunque modo rem." Having fixed the cathedral of Carlisle (for York and Chichester, which they instance, have non-residentiaries) as the one model, as the ideal of a cathedral, for "carrying fully into effect the purposes of their institution;"—(The cathedral also of Carlisle as well as its chapter surely was the model upon which

the magnificent and elevated pile of Canterbury was formed, the founder of Canterbury could have had no further views than he of Carlisle;) having taken this as their maximum of cathedral magnificence, every thing else is swept away; the fifty-one non-residentiary prebends of Lincoln, "each of which, save one," (as they were afterwards reminded,) "within four hundred years, produced a bishop; and every individual cathedral in this kingdom has had a prebendary of this noble church, bishop thereof;"* every thing, prebends, canonries, separate estates, are all "dealt with" in one and the same way, as if there were no laws but those of might, no title-deeds but those of want, no right but only will, no will of a founder, no will but of the present day.

The Commissioners decided without examining, but there must of necessity be examination after they had decided. They did not inquire before they decided, and so there must needs be subsequent inquiry, in order to adapt their decisions in any degree to existing circumstances. This is visible in every part of their Reports. And this at once rendered necessary and prepared the way for a most extensive innovation on the terms of the Commission, an institution more formidable than even the existing Commission, a permanent Corporate Commission, to be invested with the power of settling details, which the Commissioners had been in too much haste, or had not information enough, to decide upon. They had, without attention to details, with bold and unshrinking hand, sketched out the model, upon which the noble and massive structures of our forefathers were to be re-constructed, and their goodly buildings turned into petty tenements, wherein men might, if they could, find shelter. Yet, when the work of destruction was to commence, some there must be to fit together the broken shafts and capitals into the rude walls of the new structure. In a word, the Commissioners had, with regard to both parts of their subject, the arrangement of dioceses, and the spoliation of chapters, settled *what* was to be done, or rather undone, but they had, through lack of information, settled little or nothing as to *how* it was to be done.

Beginnings are generally slight; and so, in this second Report, this new body is but indistinctly hinted at. The first sketch of it is thus drawn with reference to the remodelling of dioceses;†—

"Minor objections have been made to other parts of the proposed territorial divisions of dioceses, which it is not necessary now to specify;

* Willis's Hist. of Cathedrals, quoted in Lincoln Memorial, l. c. p. 111.

† Rep. 2, p. 2.

for, with regard to this, and indeed to *most of the measures*, which, in the discharge of our duty, we have recommended, or may have to recommend, to your majesty, it will be requisite, for the purpose of carrying them fully into effect, that permanent authority should be vested in some persons, to be named in any act of parliament which may be passed for sanctioning those measures; who may be *capable of inquiring into details*, more fully than would be convenient for your majesty in council, with whom, we apprehend, the ultimate sanction will vest."

Transferring population from one diocese to another seemed to have little difficulty. Our episcopal system had already been so weakened by the neglect or positive offences of the government since the Revolution, that the laity are in many cases hardly conscious under what bishop they live; they think of him as one who has to direct the discipline and often the appointments of the clergy, and so is indirectly concerned with them; or they do value the graces of an individual as an eminent ecclesiastic: but, further, they do not conceive that they live in any special relation to him. In the clergy it might seem want of respect to the bishop to whom they were to be transferred, to raise any objection to the change; and, besides, they believed that it had the common sanction of the whole body of the bishops. However this may be, except when men were to be altogether deprived of a bishop, the transfer was made without opposition or difficulty; not so revenue and money. Here, as soon as details began to be investigated, difficulties were seen, which the expeditious presentment of the said Report had given no time even to glance at. They discovered* that—

"The peculiar manner of leasing the episcopal estates throws great difficulties in the way of carrying into effect the arrangement suggested in our First Report. If the estates were let at rack rents, so that each bishop might receive every year about that which is stated to be his average annual income, it would be easy, upon the occurrence of a vacancy in one of the richer sees, to require the future bishop to pay a certain annual sum towards the augmentation of the poorer sees. But the great variation which occurs in the episcopal incomes from year to year, according as a greater or less amount of fines is received, presents an obvious difficulty."

Thus then a more complex expedient became necessary than that recommended in the First Report; they had, it seems, gone upon a rough estimate of the episcopal incomes, and had not even taken into account, what from their own experience they must have well known, that the annual income of each see varies very considerably, and that therefore the payments to be made by

* Report 2, p. 3.

the "richer sees" must be very irregular. This variation, although not much felt now, when bishops are allowed to hold commendams, would be felt very sensibly, if any great variation were to take place in the reduced income of from 4000*l.* to 5000*l.* This consideration produced difficulties, amid which the Commissioners in the Second Report seem to toss to and fro, throwing out a suggestion or two, but with no very definite prospect of its holding or mooring them safely; so that again this new undefined "body" is called in. To meet these exigencies, it is suggested, that the ordinary expedient of bankrupts must be resorted to.

"The reversions of some estates may perhaps be advantageously sold. Such sales can now be effected only under the authority of an act of parliament: we would therefore suggest the expediency of giving power to effect them, under certain restrictions, and with the consent of *the body to which we have referred.*"

It is important to notice this change of tone in the two Reports. Rep. 1. speaks of "*enabling* the incumbents of the richer sees to pay, &c." Rep. 2. of "*requiring* of the future bishop;—the sums *to be deducted* from the income of a future bishopric;" so that it is no longer an arrangement of the bishops among themselves, but a compulsory regulation from without, which they who made, might re-make as they pleased. But, beyond this, a power is to be given of selling episcopal estates, *with the consent*, not of the bishops whose they are or were, but of *the body referred to.* If so, the independence of the bishops is gone.

A further invasion of the authority of the bishops, and enlargement of the powers of this body, is prepared in the recommendations with regard to pluralities and the union of smaller benefices; but still undefined. It was suggested that certain cases of pluralities may be allowed upon statements made by the bishop to the archbishop, and transmitted, with his sanction, to the *privy council.* "The union of two benefices," it is said,—

"May now be done, under certain restrictions, *by the bishop*, with the consent of the patron. But there exists a degree of uncertainty as to the circumstances under which it can be legally done, which it is desirable to remove by a more strict and precise limitation."

And how is this done? One should have thought that the natural remedy, instead of a more precise limitation, would have been to have put greater confidence in, and give greater latitude to, the bishops. The remedy as to the union of benefices (remarkably enough) is not even hinted at in this Report, except by the juxta-position of a provision that the "*separation* of unions shall be effected by his majesty in council, on the *recommendation* of the bishop, certified by such Commissioners as may be appointed

for the purposes connected with this Report." The Plurality-bill, recently introduced, furnishes, however, a comment, and transfers the whole, union and dis-union, and the alteration of the boundaries of parishes, to the "standing Commission." But of this hereafter.

Further powers for this new permanent Commission are provided by the indefiniteness of the propositions with regard to the cathedrals. Up to a certain point the measures are definite enough; the confiscation of every thing in every cathedral, except the corporate revenues of a dean and four canons, (even their separate endowments are to be forfeited) "at one fell swoop," is unhappily plain enough; but what shall be done with the spoils, or with the yet unspoiled fragments of the cathedrals, remained undecided. It is easy to pull down, but not to build up. The Commissioners propose *one* scheme of disposing of this surplus; state, over against each other, the "sum required to augment all benefices of a certain population and income according to a proposed scale;"* and what can be extracted by the proposed confiscation of stalls.† But they subjoin that they

"Are far from intending that an inference should be drawn from this statement, as to our opinion respecting the best mode of distributing the sum, whatever it may be, which will be derived from the adoption of the propositions which we are about to offer. The question as to the *general principles of distribution* requires the most serious consideration, and much additional inquiry; and we must reserve, for the present, any distinct recommendation."

Thus then the Commissioners had decided how much they would take from the cathedrals, *i. e.* that they would take all which could be taken, without having settled even the "general principles of distribution:" this required the "most serious consideration and *much* additional inquiry;" and yet but a little additional inquiry might have shown, (as we shall hereafter show,) that more might be done for this very end by preserving the chapters than by destroying them. But we cannot sufficiently deprecate this way of disarming all opposition to the plunder of the cathedral, by exhibiting that others want and that they have; the very argument which revolutionists continually employ against all property, and more, hitherto, against that of such as the Commissioners, lay as well as ecclesiastic, than against the cathedrals. But if this be full of evil in any case, much more when the cupidity to be roused is that of men who ought most to be free from covetousness, the large body of the clergy. It was inexcusable to bring forward a plan unmaturing, and incapable of

* Report 2, p. 6, and App. No. 2.

† *Ib.* p. 10, and App. Nos. 4, 177.

being matured, by which 2971 clergy might be led to speculate how much of the spoils of the cathedrals might fall to their share; and since this was one plan only, not only they, but various other classes of the clergy, were taught to look upon the destruction of the cathedrals as a benefit to them.* This is no imaginary case; among a large body of men it could hardly be otherwise; Scripture prohibits to take "a gift to *blind* thine eyes withall;" and we have met with those whose eyes have been thus blinded. It were unstatesman-like, thus to raise uncertain expectations, which, on their own showing, cannot be satisfied; to pull institutions to pieces without settling what to raise in their stead; to carry through one half of a plan, and reserve for future "most serious consideration and additional inquiry" the other half upon which it is dependent; but it is worse than this, it is unholy, thus to tempt those "in whose mouth is the law of truth" (Mal. ii. 6), to break the law, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house—nor any thing that is his."

The other point with regard to cathedrals, which *could* be settled, was the employment of the remaining stalls. The Report sets out with stating that the Commissioners

"Are now prepared to recommend such measures as will, in our opinion, leave a sufficient provision for the proper performance of the services of the churches, for the continual reparation and maintenance of the fabrics, and for the other objects contemplated by the founders."

And so it would be thought that at least the stalls saved out of the wreck would have been sacred for the objects contemplated by the founder; that pious learning or clerical education, or a tranquil and intercessory devotion, or contemplative piety, might at least have found a refuge in this remainder.† At least,

* Notwithstanding the protest above quoted, there seemed considerable probability that the plan which the Commissioners took so much pains to exhibit in detail, setting forth the sums which would accrue to the parochial clergy in every diocese, according to the proposed scale, was the plan then uppermost in their mind. At least, they distinguish the benefices in private from those in public patronage, (App. 2,) state, that the latter would, "in the first instance, be the preferable objects of assistance from the fund;" (page 5,) calculate how much those in public patronage would require, on this scale, and show that the sum total would be 145,195*l.* per annum, which curiously harmonizes with the sum which it was proposed to "abstract" from the cathedrals and sinecure rectories, above 130,000*l.* per annum. Lord John Russell, a Commissioner, drew this very parallel, in the debate, July 19, 1836, as a proof of what was to be done for poor livings. "There is a scale established, by which livings of less than 150*l.*, with a population under 1000, are to be raised to 150*l.*" &c., (Mirr. of Parl. 2464.) Sufficient uncertainty, however, was left to give some hopes for some livings in private patronage.

† "Archbishop Leighton thought it the *great and fatal error* of the Reformation, that more of those [religious] houses, and of that course of life, free from the entanglements of vows, and other mixtures, was not preserved. So that the Protestant Churches had neither places of education nor retreat for men of mortified tempers." Burnet's History of his Own Times, vol. i. p. 139. See other extracts from Cranmer and others, in "Prospective and Past Benefits of Cathedral Institutions, by E. B. Pusey," pp. 85, sqq. 2d ed.

what is so much wanted, in the wilderness of our larger dioceses, some intermediate officers, a link* between the bishop and the parochial clergy, might have been provided; some who, having larger leisure for mature thought, should at once fulfil the primitive duty of being a council to the bishop, and solve the difficulties which are continually embarrassing the younger clergy.† So, probably, the Commissioners thought and meant at first; but having once allowed themselves to think the cathedral property at their disposal, as they go on, they open this question also.‡

“ With respect to some of the better endowed canonries, which will remain in four or five of the cathedrals, we are of opinion, that they may be advantageously connected with the parochial charge of populous districts. The method of effecting this, we reserve for our future consideration; it being necessary to examine carefully the case of each cathedral, with reference to its revenues and local circumstances.”

So then, again, it appears, on their own showing, which we know from other sources, and which indeed the members of chapters represented to them, that this sweeping destruction of ancient institutions was resolved upon without “ examining carefully the case of each cathedral.” Had examination preceded, instead of following, the result would have been very different. But now (as by the judge of old) the cathedrals are sentenced first, tried afterwards; the thing to be done is decided upon unhesitatingly and without knowledge of the case; all the difficulties in doing it are made over to the permanent Commission; they are to do it as they *can*, and, as a compensation, have the full power of doing it *as they like*, plenipotentiaries and irresponsible. And herein the unhappiness of the one false step taken as to the stall of Westminster is apparent; for this was done at least with some notice; but the permanent and irresponsible Commission have thus received a precedent, of subdividing stalls as they please. If a stall may be divided into two, no further principle is involved in dividing it into twenty; and so it will be fully in the power of this Commission to “ pulverize the (remaining) stalls,” employing each to eke out any given number of petty stipends of 30*l.* per annum, such as the habit of this day affords as endowments. This is in their power, and it is but in the natural course of things, that on the principle of this Commission it should sooner or later

* This is well insisted on in the “ General Memorial ” of the chapters, and in those from Exeter and Lincoln.

† See some good hints as to the uses of a well-appointed cathedral clergy, in “ Are Cathedral Institutions useless ? ” Some points mixed up as to societies, charities, &c. seem questionable, because our charities and large societies are for the most part at present on so utterly un-church a plan. The importance of cathedrals, in point of learning, is the main subject of a valuable memorial from Winchester; it is urged also more or less in those from Bristol, Ely, Oxford, Worcester, Westminster, Exeter, Lincoln.

‡ Report 2, p. 11.

be done. And this is an especial mischief of a permanent Commission, that it thus affords a means of carrying out endlessly a system, which those in authority are, at present, but partially prepared to adopt. It is a continued dropping, whose proverbial power will wear away the most enduring rocks.

This destruction of stalls furnished the occasion of another exceeding of the Commission, the transfer of—(we can hardly write the word *patronage*, it is so connected with the sordid trading notions of the day, whereby trusts are regarded as rights, and rights measured by a mere estimate of profit and loss)—the transfer of the appointments hitherto invested in the chapters from them to the bishops.

These appointments are of two sorts; first, “by a custom* prevailing in most of the cathedrals of the old foundations, the residentiaries are elected by the chapter from among the other prebendaries, who are in all cases appointed by the bishop.” These appointments the Report recommended “should henceforth be made directly by the bishop.” Why? why should the electors be changed, simply because the individuals out of whom the election is to be made is changed? Some alteration was necessary, if the non-residentiaries were to be abolished: but why not leave the election in the hands in which it had been placed, even if they, from whom the selection was to be made, must be different? And yet, in the majority of cases, according to *this* Report, the non-residentiaries would have been spared; for all were to be spared, “the income of which was little more than nominal,” and these, it was thought, “it might be expedient to retain, as marks of distinction to be bestowed upon deserving clergymen.”†

The other class of appointments is, that of benefices in the gift of the chapters. The Commissioners say,—

“The alterations, which we have proposed, with respect both to the arrangement of dioceses, and the constitution of deans and chapters, appear to us to render it *expedient* that a change should be made in the exercise of the patronage which is now vested in the last-mentioned bodies. We recommend that such regulations *should* be adopted, as may leave it in the power of deans and chapters, under certain restrictions, to give preferment to the members of their own body, and to the minor canons, who may reasonably look to them for reward after a certain period of service: and that where the presentation to any benefice in their gift is not required for these purposes, it should pass, in some cases to the crown, and in others to the bishop of the diocese in which either the cathedral or the benefice may be respectively situate.”

* “This (the direct appointment by the bishop) is a change in their fundamental constitution. The chapter of Exeter was *always* an elective chapter.”—*Memorials*, p. 78.

† Rep. 2, p. 10.

This "expediency," the Fourth Report places in the

"Strengthening *by all possible means* the connexion between the bishop and the clergy of his diocese, and so proposes to transfer to the hands of the respective bishops the remainder of the chapter livings, as an addition to the means which they already possess, of placing laborious and deserving clergymen in situations of usefulness and independence."

But among many other "possible means of strengthening that connexion," we should have doubted the "expediency" of one, viz. WRONG and ROBBERY. Whatever benefit might have accrued, had the livings been placed originally in the hands of the bishops, (and we are not here concerned with the question in whose hands they had originally been best placed,) nothing but disgrace would result from such a violent transfer. It was a sorry exhibition to see a Commission, of which the ecclesiastical members were bishops, transfer to their own order what belonged to another, and take "from one what is his and give it to another whose it is not."* But this whole plea of "strengthening the connexion of the bishops and their clergy," is an after-thought of the fourth Report; for the second recommended, that the presentation "should pass *in some cases to the crown*, in others to the bishop of the diocese;" so that the Commissioners (one part, by "custom" against right, disposing of the patronage of the crown, the others being bishops,) legislated as joint spoilers for themselves or for their order. The first notion (as the distribution between the crown and the bishops shows) was a mere *quid pro quo*, a compensation, a mere balance sheet of profits and losses. If the stalls are to be destroyed, there will be so much direct patronage lost to the bishops or the crown, and so it must be made up, was the principle of this change. It might have been thought that if these sweeping confiscations *were* a good to the Church, the crown and the bishops might well be content to submit to their share of privation; or that if chapters were such useless, incorrigible bodies, the bishops and the crown sustained no great loss in ceasing to nominate; at any rate, good is best purchased by some suffering; or, at the lowest, since the spoils were in the first instance to be distributed among livings in public *patronage*, they might have been contented with the indirect return, to be made to them through the augmentation of their livings. But no! upon the principle observable throughout these Reports, whereby patronage and the rights of patrons are the standard of measurement, the patrons' interests were to be secured; nothing which concerned them was to be risked or touched, and so the chapters were stigmatized, and their influence further impaired, in order to

* General Chapter Memorial, p. 4,

secure the crown and the bishops from the loss of patronage. The exchange, like the rest of their acts, is often a sweeping and a very uneven one;* but it was not the character of the Commission to stop at details. By the change in the fourth Report, however, a new principle was brought in by a side wind; the ground of compensation was abandoned; the crown was to look, for its return, to the improvement of its livings, but it was "expedient, by all possible means, to strengthen the connection between the bishop and his clergy." Be it so: be it that it is better that all should resign their patronage into the hands of the bishops, (and we should be glad to see, in private patrons, this mark of confidence in their bishops,) yet the principle is pernicious, that because a thing were a good, if done, therefore it is a good to do it any how; it is very dangerous to see great principles and precedents creeping in thus stealthily.

* The following is a balance sheet of profit and loss in the patronage of those who have at present the nomination to stalls. It is apparent that nothing can compensate to the Bishop of Durham, e. g. patronage the highest of its kind in the Church, while in Carlisle, on this estimate of loss and gain, all is gain to the patron and no loss. From the gain is to be deducted such livings as the remaining canons would be allowed to take to themselves, (if unprovided for,) or to bestow on the minor canons; if the plan of annexation, proposed in the fourth Report, was carried out, the former class would be 0, for the canons would already have the livings annexed to their stalls.

PATRONAGE,	Loss.		GAIN.			
	Resid.	Non-Resid.	Benefices.	Alternate.	Canons	Resid.
Canterbury	8		26 7		
York		24	19		4
London		26	34 11		1
Durham	8		39			
Winchester	8		19			
Bath and Wells		42	19		4
Bristol.....	2		33			
Carlisle	0		39			
Chester	0		11			
Chichester		29	18 2		4
Ely	4		18			
Exeter.....		15 of £20.	48		4
Gloucester	2		20			
Hereford		23	22			
Lichfield and Coventry	2	18	9			
Lincoln		43	37		1
Norwich	2		42			
Peterborough	2		7			
Rochester	2		30			
Sarum		35	16 2		
Worcester	6		36 1		

According to Report 4, the Archbishop of Canterbury loses 1 stall, the Bishops of Bristol, Gloucester, (or rather the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol,) Norwich, Rochester, Worcester, lose nothing, but have the preferment of the chapters assigned to them on the new principle, as would, we suppose, the 25 benefices of Westminster to the Bishop of London, and the 55 of Windsor to the Bishop of Oxford.

The whole subject, however, of patronage, as treated in these Reports, is an illustration of the tendency of any Commission, to form employment for itself, and transgress the bounds prescribed to it. The subject of patronage formed no part of the Commission issued; the Commissioners had no more right to treat upon it, than upon alterations in the Liturgy, or any other subject which reformers have thought for the benefit of the Church. Regarded as a *trust*, the four surviving canons could exercise it as well as the more flourishing body, of which they were to be the remnant and representatives; regarded even as patronage, they had the less temptation, by reason of their very fewness, to pervert it to selfish purposes. The very regulations under which a portion was left, as well as the withdrawal, sanctioned the principle, that it was given, or was to be used, for selfish ends; they went on that “truck, barter, and exchange” justice, which regards patronage as a privilege, not as a duty, as a matter of private advantage to the individuals, as a provision. On such a principle it was rightly accounted that the diminished chapters would need a diminished number of livings to bestow upon themselves, and so as if to guide them so to do, livings enough were left them to supply themselves with, and take their choice of; and the most objectionable sort of nomination, that of virtual self-nomination, was recognized, and, as it were, recommended to them. They were enjoined almost to bestow the best of the livings upon themselves; they were enjoined to bestow them upon the subordinate members of the cathedral; but they were prohibited from bestowing them upon such, as they have hitherto very frequently bestowed them upon, deserving persons not connected with themselves. The chapters were to be accustomed to bestow the livings upon their own members, but if any member or members of a chapter were contented to remain as they were, then they were to be prohibited from bestowing them upon any deserving clergyman; they were to satisfy themselves, if they pleased, but they were stigmatized as unfit to be the channel of bestowing a benefit on others. But further, what excuse was there for transferring the nomination in those cathedrals, whose numbers were yet undiminished? Was it an object with the Commissioners, that no sort of “vested right,” (we speak of rights “vested” in bodies, not according to the selfish notion which would limit it to individuals,)—was it a principle that no right attached to the Church should remain undisturbed? The subject is one which it is miserable to dwell upon, but it illustrates how such an institution as the Commission gradually absorbs into itself subjects foreign to its appointment.

There yet remains one subject to be mentioned, indicative of the entire change of plan between the conservative and what might justly be called the destructive Commission. The alteration was, at the same time, in contravention to the plain meaning of the terms of the powers given to them. It was (as above said) a prominent and the best feature of that Commission, that bishops should endow out of the property of their sees the populous and poorly endowed curacies and vicarages of which they had the impropriations; this was just and right; the impropriations were given to ecclesiastical persons or bodies with that very *condition* of supplying the spiritual wants of the places which gave them; the very possession implies a duty; and the facilities of fulfilling it had been much enlarged by a valuable act procured by the chief Ecclesiastical Commissioner, (1 & 2 Will. IV. c. 45,) commonly called "The Archbishop of Canterbury's enabling Act." This plan has also advantages, as we shall show hereafter, which no other plan has; it had been held out to the inhabitants of North Wales as a ground for giving up one of their bishops:—

"That so a part of the impropriations, which constitute nearly the whole property of the bishoprics, might be applied to the poor and populous vicarages of the united diocese."

It was recommended on this ground, that

"There should be annexed to some of the poorer bishoprics certain cathedral preferments, particularly in the chapters of St. Paul's and Westminster, on account of their position in the metropolis,"

a plan which has been virtually acted upon from time immemorial without any disadvantage; yet now, either because it was a more compendious process, and required less delay and examination, or from some theory of destroying commendams altogether, (although the only objectionable commendams are those specified in the Commission "*commendams with cure of souls*"); or lest the beautiful symmetry of the new-modelled chapters with their dean and four canons only should be disturbed, this plan is abandoned, the vicarages left to take their share as they might out of the confiscated cathedrals, and the whole income of Bangor transferred from Wales to the Commissioners' English Episcopal Fund.*

* The extent of change produced in the plan of the Commission, by this one innovation, may be inferred from the fact, that in 1836 all the poorer bishoprics, (except Peterborough, which was held with the Margaret professorship of divinity, Cambridge,) viz. Bristol, Carlisle, Chester, Exeter, Gloucester, Hereford, Llandaff, Oxford, Rochester, St. David's, were held with cathedral preferment. According to the return of the Commissioners their respective net incomes, as provided by these annexations, were as follows:—Bristol, 3564*l.*; Carlisle, 4456*l.*; Chester, 7166*l.*; Exeter, 6167*l.*; Gloucester, 3414*l.*; Hereford, 3750*l.*; Llandaff, 6418*l.*; Oxford, 3392*l.*; Rochester,

This was unjust; we contend, every other question apart, that no right existed anywhere to transfer one 6*d.* of the Archbishop of Canterbury's income to other bishoprics, until the "poor and *populous* vicarages," of which the archiepiscopal see is impropiator, were adequately provided for. His grace might dispense it as he pleased; but these places are his grace's heirs; and any transfer of the property of the see elsewhere, was to deprive them of their natural inheritance. His grace had, by virtue of his own Act, done this, as occasion offered; yet, as far as the "Ecclesiastical Revenues Commission" may be trusted, when carried fully into effect, there had been no surplus to spare. The same holds most strongly, on their own showing, of Bangor and St. Asaph; it holds, in its degree, of most of the rest,—Durham, Ely, Winchester, Worcester, Bath and Wells; there was no right anywhere, the whole Church had no right, to withdraw one 6*d.* of their revenues, until they had supplied all the spiritual wants of the places whose tithes they held. We should say further, the bishop, as he appoints, so is he the centre of the mission of, his clergy; he holds the common funds,* so it is for him to fill up the unoccupied ground, and, as the delegate of the Lord of the harvest, in His name to send forth fresh labourers into the harvest. We should therefore contend again that there was no right to abstract one 6*d.* from the revenue of Durham, or London, or Winchester, for other bishoprics, so long as there was one desolate parish unprovided with a curate, much more with the tens of thousands in the bishop of Winchester's suburban, or the Bishop of London's metropolitan, districts, or the collieries of the north.†

This departure from the first Report was also, as was said, a departure from the instructions of the Commission under which they acted. This directed them "to the prevention of the necessity of attaching by commendams to bishoprics, benefices *with*

2945*l.*; St. David's, 9063*l.*; in all 50,266*l.* of which 29,445*l.* was derived from their cathedral preferments. Rather more than 4-7ths of the virtual income of these eleven, which are all the poorer, sees save one, was thus at once withdrawn. And these annexations had been made not, on the whole, accidentally, but on a system, as appears, in that one other bishopric only was held with cathedral preferment, viz. Lichfield and Coventry with a prebend of Westminster, which made its income 5564*l.* In 1836, four bishops were prebends of Westminster, and two provided for by preferment in St. Paul's, so that the plan of Report 1, which was thus broken up, was taken from actual practice. (In calculating the above bishoprics, except in the case of St. David's, in which it is expressly stated that the average given cannot be depended upon in future, the future estimated income has been taken as given in Report 2, since the average of three years is obviously of no value.)

* See Bingham's Antiq. 9. 8. 6.

† This was rightly contended for, though mixed up with some objectionable positions, by the liberal members for the county, as is thankfully acknowledged by Archdeacon Thorpe, Charge, p. 10, but opposed by the ministry and the conservatives.

cure of souls;" and thereby this "does*" in fact naturally lead the mind to the consideration of the deaneries and chapters, as the means through which an annexation may be effected, when such benefices are withdrawn."

It is plain, in fact, that in objecting to "commendams *with* cure of souls," it was intended (as the first Commissioners understood their Commission) to convey that "commendams *without* cure of souls" were unobjectionable; yet, in this Report, the arrangements as to the bishoprics are, through this alteration, wholly changed, without any hint being given that the Commissioners were proceeding upon an altered plan. The new Commissioners seem to have regarded themselves, as (which they have been designated†) "those to whom is committed the re-adjustment of the discipline and revenues of the church;" and to have regarded the Commission as a mere formal act, which should give them powers, but, in giving, could not restrain them. This was natural; they went into the Commission with their views unsettled; reform generates reform; and as they became gradually inured to each successive reform, they forgot (as men are wont to do) the point whereat they started; they glided insensibly from one to the other, until the scene was altogether shifted, without their perceiving how far they had wandered. So it ever is; it is always instructive, after a few years of reform, to look back upon the language, and principles, and maxims, which were current a little before: they bear a different stamp; they set out with different assumptions; they imply a different train of ideas to have been familiar to men's minds; people do not wilfully part from what they held, but they glide downwards. The Commissioners did not, we are sure, wilfully transgress their Commission; but summer melts imperceptibly into autumn, and autumn passes gradually into winter, and the days shorten, unfelt save at intervals. In moral as in physical nature, transitions are unmarked at the time, and may be easily overlooked, wide as the difference in the end is. This is not said, then, to blame the Commissioners, but as a warning, how little permanence of character would belong to a Permanent Commission.

And now it may be well to exhibit in a tabular form, the variations between the Reports of the Commission in its two stages, with a Conservative and Whig administration, and between the latter and the Commission itself.

* Newman's Suffragan Bishops, p. 7.

† First Visitation Charge of the Archdeacon of Bristol, p. 15, ap. Dr. Spry, p. 34:

COMMISSION.

To consider the state of the several dioceses in England and Wales,(1) with reference to the amount of their revenues,(2) and the more equal distribution of episcopal duties, and the prevention of the necessity of attaching by commendam to bishoprics benefices *with* cure of souls.(3)

And also considering the state of the several cathedral and collegiate churches in England and Wales, with a view to the suggestion of such measures, as may render *them* (4) most conducive to the efficiency of the Established Church.

And for the better enabling you to fulfil the objects of this our Commission, we do by these presents give and grant to you, or any three or more of you, full power and authority to call before you such persons(5) as you shall judge necessary, by whom you may be the better informed on the subjects herein submitted for your consideration.

And our further will and pleasure is, that you or any three or more of you do and shall, with all convenient speed,(6) report to us your opinions as to what measures it would be convenient to adopt on the several points *herein* submitted to your consideration.(7)

REPORT I.

(2) Leaves the apportionment of the revenues (about which the Commission was silent) to the bishops themselves.

(3) Removes commendams *with* cure of souls; leaves, as before, commendams *without* cure of souls, with a view to "give back the impropriations in whole or in part to poor and populous parishes."

(4) Annexes to a stall of Westminster the cure of a large parish, dividing the parish into two, and prospectively three; suggests the union of others with bishoprics, for the object No. 3.

(5) "We have used our best endeavours to learn the opinions of the several bishops, respecting these proposed arrangements as far as they affect the respective dioceses, and have availed ourselves of many suggestions which their local knowledge enabled them to supply."

(6) Recommends in six weeks a plan for remodelling all the dioceses of England and Wales.

(7) Confined to the subjects of the Commission.

REPORT II.

(1) Suppresses the bishopric of Sodor and Mann.

(2) Makes the payments compulsory upon the bishops, and the bishops dependant, and proposes to sell their estates without their consent.

(3) Abolishes commendams without cure of souls also, and so prevents augmentation of cures whereof the bishoprics have the tithes.

(4) Reduces the cathedrals to a dean and four canons, and takes away the revenues of the confiscated stalls, and the separate estates of the remaining.

(5) Declines the information offered by the chapters, and invites no one—reserves all especial consideration of each cathedral to a future time, and for a future Commission.

(6) Gives (as well as Report I) imperfect recommendations, and recommends the establishment of a permanent Commission, i. e. of themselves as a permanent corporate body.

(7) Recommends suppression of bishopric of Sodor and Mann, of majority of cathedral stalls, dispensation with statutes and oaths therewith connected, dissolution of all colleges and corporations of minor canons, restraining the patronage of chapters to themselves or dependants, and transfer of the rest to the crown or the bishop, of all which there is nothing in the Commission.

The Third Report was a supplement to the first on the change in bishoprics, as the fourth was to the second on the confiscation of chapters. They are principally occupied in details, giving the "further remarks" of the Commissioners on those subjects. The third bore date May 20, 1836, the fourth June 24. It was supplementary, accordingly, or corrective of a Report, which had been presented rather more than three months before.

They contain no new principle, but they possess a melancholy interest in showing how soon persons become familiarized to those which they have half adopted. They possess a higher, though still more melancholy, interest in that they show how much good feeling was yet left in the country, which might have been called forth, and would have readily answered the call, but which, in the panic of those years, or in the ignorance of its existence, was neglected by the Commissioners and stifled. It is very interesting to observe the difficulties which the Commissioners met at every step in destroying or suppressing a bishopric. One object proposed apparently was to get rid of the bishopric of Bristol, in order to make way for that of Ripon, so that no question about the bishops' seats in the House of Lords might be moved, the number of bishops remaining the same as before. The first Report presented two plans.

"1st, to unite it with Gloucester; which involved this objection, that the great and populous city of Bristol would no longer be the residence of a bishop, 2d, with Llandaff, though it could not be denied that the interposition of the Bristol Channel between the two parts of the diocese will produce *some* inconvenience."

The second plan was recommended as the lesser of two evils. Before the Second Report, however, the members of the diocese of Llandaff (whom there had been before no time to consult) remonstrated, "and the representations operated so strongly on the minds of the Commissioners, as to induce them, on reconsideration, to relinquish that plan." They, therefore, recommended that the diocese of Bristol should be further divided, the city and suburbs of Bristol to be united with Bath and Wells, the rest with Gloucester. In the month, however, which elapsed before the Third Report, the Commissioners

"learned that this proposition occasioned *much dissatisfaction* to the inhabitants of the city of Bristol, who have represented, in strong terms, their objections to a plan which would merge their episcopal see in that of Bath and Wells, and *their earnest desire to retain the advantages of the pastoral superintendence and example of a bishop resident among them.*"

So then the Commissioners recurred, at last, to the first alternative, and united Bristol and Gloucester, making, however, the

concession that a second house should be built near Bristol, and a larger income in consequence allotted to the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. Would that this experience could have opened the eyes of the Commissioners, and instead of shifting from post to post, presenting the strange spectacle of bishops devising expedients to get rid of a bishopric, and baffled, at each essay, by the desire of laymen to retain it,—would that they had fixed the feeling which still lasts, and looking not to the clamours of infidels and republicans, congregated in our large towns, where the Church has neglected them, but to churchmen, had retained a bishop for Bristol instead of making it a sort of half-bishopric! It were, of course, the wisdom of the Church to extend herself wherever she conveniently can, to make her offices and her existence vividly present to people's minds, to lay hold of all their instinctive feelings, and, through attachment to herself, wherever such attachment exists, win men's hearts to the acknowledgment and love of Him, Whose body she is. It was, then, a strange and sad reversal of her natural and instinctive policy, to withdraw herself where she had existing attachments and antient recollections, where she was identified with the reformation; to retire from a city, whose troubles at least have made it cling still more to her—to shake it off and retreat from a place where she had been received and lodged; to retreat instead of advancing.

The Third Report however made some advances upon the foregoing, chiefly in regard to the "permanent Commission." In Report II. it is called "some persons to be named by act of parliament," p. 2; "the body to which we have referred," p. 4; "whatever body be appointed," p. 5; but these circumlocutions were only necessary to introduce this new power to the Church, and familiarize people to it. In Report III. it is every where boldly set out and at length, "whatever shall be determined by the Commissioners;" "that the Commissioners should have the power of recommending;" "a new return of the revenues of each see should be made to the Commissioners;" "that the Commissioners should be empowered," *passim*.

The (existing) Commissioners had by this time discovered, that the object for which they received their commission was impracticable, at least by *them*, on their plan, with their information, and with their rate of deliberation. They, or such of them as were concerned in the Report, (for most only assented to it,) had sketched with a rapid and bold hand an outline for equalizing the duties and incomes of bishoprics; but details ever revenge themselves upon those who neglect them; they had not been taken into account before, and so they would obstinately insist on

being regarded now: and since this was inconvenient, this new standing Commission was devised, to which every thing requiring knowledge of details was made over, gently at first, as one setting out on his travels is wont to begin by laying softly and smoothly into his valise, the things which he cannot otherwise dispose of, until at last it is filled and swelled with the heterogeneous contents usually assigned to it.

Thus the contrivance of dividing the episcopate between Gloucester and Bristol involved the novel arrangement of having two chapters to one bishopric; and as the inhabitants of Bristol might have the same partiality for their chapter as for their bishop, the simple expedient of blotting out the chapter of Bristol was not resorted to. But some acts of the bishop require to be confirmed by the chapter! By which then was this to be done, or by both, or by neither? The matter is made over from the Commissioners *in esse* to those *in posse*, and these were to "determine the mode of confirming such acts, subject to the approval of his majesty in council." The chapters, of course, were not to be consulted. The precedent would have been bad.

Alterations, again, were re-made in the new-modelled or new made dioceses of Carlisle, Ripon, Manchester, Gloucester, and Worcester; and these changes were enough to show the Commissioners that many more might be required; this power, therefore, also of re-modelling the boundaries of dioceses was made over to the Commissioners *in posse*.

The incomes of the bishoprics could be still less settled than their boundaries; and certainly, from authentic accounts which we have received, great injustice would have been done to the contributing bishops, had their payments been fixed permanently, on such data, or rather absence of adequate data, as the Commissioners possessed when they arranged them. Besides this, the symptoms of the bankruptcy which has since overtaken the Commission, glean through the third Report. Report I stated their

"Opinion that when the annual income of a bishop amounts to 4500*l.* it is not necessary to make any addition, nor would we recommend any diminution *unless it exceed 5,500*l.**

But Bath and Wells was calculated at 5,500*l.*; accordingly even in Report II. it escapes schedule B.; but the six weeks which had since elapsed, had discovered some defalcation of revenue; so without formally withdrawing Report I., Report III. places Bath and Wells among the bishoprics to be reduced. In Report II., to give a clearer view of the financial part of the subject, the present incomes of the larger sees, and the proposed reductions, "had been given in a tabular form," so that there

could be no mistake. Yet six weeks afterwards it is found necessary to "abstract" 600*l.* per annum, afterwards 1100*l.* from York, 700*l.* more from Worcester, 500*l.*, then 1000*l.* from Bath and Wells; with what justice to these dioceses we shall examine hereafter. With these precedents the Commissioners wisely thought it expedient to have a septennial review of the sums paid (no longer to Queen Anne's Bounty) but to the Commissioners, that they might revise the scale of episcopal payments.

The changes thus made in the episcopal incomes required a change in the scale of first-fruits and tenths: this also was matter of detail, and so to be made over to the standing Commission. Alterations in episcopal patronage, such as these new arrangements shall require, are referred to the same body: so are (to forestall a little) in the fourth Report, the approval of the statutes of chapters, to be revised in consequence of these changes; the disposal of the future surplus of the ROYAL peculiar of Wimborne Minster; power to increase archdeaconries to 200*l.* per annum; compulsory exchanges of advowsons in certain cases, *except when in the hands of laymen*; the subdivision of two stalls in Westminster; power to endow the college of Lampeter with "any part of the remaining property belonging to the canonries, prebends, dignities, and offices of the cathedrals of Wales;" and even to *purchase therewith the patronage* of "any benefices with cure of souls, now connected with that establishment." They were, besides, receivers-general of all the confiscated property of the chapters, which in Report 2 was assigned over to a corporation already existing, Queen Anne's Bounty. This last might seem a trifling alteration; but in reality it transferred the property from a body, consisting simply of bishops and of *all* the bishops, to one consisting of five bishops only (the episcopal commissioners), with eight laymen; so that thenceforth a lay board was to apportion out our bishops' incomes: they were not to allot it among themselves; it was to be done for them without their concurrence or against it. There was not after this, of course, the shadow of any rights of ecclesiastical property; the English was no longer an established Church; it became, as far as the bishops were concerned, a *voluntary* Church in its bad sense,—a Church dependent for its income on the voluntas of the minister of the day. Such was the standing Commission in its outset. *Ex pede disce Herculem!* Only with the gigantic stature which it must, if unchecked, one day attain, may it not resemble those giants of old time, who were enemies to God and His Church, rather than those who did service to mankind!

The Third Report, however, though it enacted little further

in detail, was not without its quota of arbitrary and encroaching enactments. In Report I., as we saw, the mode in which the richer bishoprics shall pay the poorer, was left to themselves; in the Second it was made compulsory, and a power of selling their estates assumed, on the very ground that, on account of the fluctuating incomes of the bishops from year to year, there was an obvious hardship in requiring the bishop to pay a *fixed* annual sum. Report III. retains the power (for power obtained is never relinquished, even if it cease to be wanted for the immediate occasion)—it retains the power of selling the bishops' estates, which was assumed in some measure to prevent this hardship, and at the same time enacts the very scheme itself, with all its hardships. They say* quietly—

“In that part of our last Report which refers to the contributions to be hereafter furnished by the richer sees towards the augmentation of the poorer, we did not point out the particular mode in which such contribution might be most conveniently made. In some cases a transfer of estates may, probably, be expedient; but in general we think that the most advisable arrangement will be, that each of the bishops of the richer sees should pay to the commissioners the sum which shall be fixed upon, as his quota of contribution to the fund out of which the yearly payments are to be made in augmentation of the poorer bishoprics. Objections may, no doubt, be urged against this plan, on the ground that the fluctuating amount of the episcopal incomes may sometimes make it inconvenient to the holders of the larger sees to pay a certain fixed sum; but upon the whole we think that this mode is less open to objection than any other which has presented itself to us; and it possesses the important advantage of insuring a sufficient fund for the improvement of the smaller sees.”

One would not, of course, for a moment impute any thing like wilful selfishness to the Episcopal Commissioners; yet we cannot but think that they have provided for the poorer bishoprics at the cost of others, and perhaps were the rather deceived, in that they had to pay a certain quota themselves; yet the fluctuation of episcopal incomes might obviously create no difficulty to those who had to pay the respective sums of £2000l., 600l., and £200l. (the Commissioners' contributions), which were yet to leave them in one case the clear annual income of 15,000l., or, in the two other cases, of 10,000l., while yet it might involve very serious difficulty, where bishops have to pay a fixed sum which equals

* This Report, we understand, has never been published in the parliamentary form, because “the diocesan maps referred to in the second Report, and the completion of which was delayed by the necessity for reconsidering some of the territorial arrangements,” were still uncompleted for the same reason, although the body of the Report speaks of them as finished. These extracts are reprinted from the *British Magazine*, No. 56, p. 193.

their whole income, as where Ely was to pay 5500*l.*, retaining the same. Certainly, if episcopal incomes vary like those of chapters, (and it is known that a larger proportion of their property being let out upon the old tenure of lives, they are much more fluctuating), the incomes of the once wealthy sees of Ely and Winchester may, in single years, be far below the average of those bishoprics which they are called upon to assist.* Durham, which is to contribute more than as much as it is allowed to retain, yet which, out of some regard to the ancient liberality which that see was wont to exercise, is for a time to be kept above the average, would scarcely exceed it. Worcester, Bath and Wells, would be also decidedly below it. Episcopal expenses are seldom calculated by those fond of dilating on the largeness of episcopal incomes. But supposing such a year to be the first year in which a person shall enter upon his bishopric,† bishops will not be able to fulfil the apostolic injunction, "Owe no man any thing." This is no improbable case; and remarkably enough it has happened, and that at the very first attempt to work this scheme. The plan being new, and the Bishop a better financier than the Commissioners, and resolute in maintaining the rights of his see as well as his own, better terms were given him. People were not prepared at once to see a Bishop of Ely considerably in debt, in order to provide out of the revenues of the see for other bishoprics. But this is only the beginning. Let but this system work on for a few years, and people become accustomed to it, and forget that the diocese of Ely was once

* Suppose the fine of any given year, (and we have data for this,) to be $\frac{1}{4}$ ths of the average sum, (and the variation, as above said, will be greater in bishoprics,) the average of Ely is put at 11,000*l.*; 1725*l.* of this is clear uniform income; $\frac{1}{4}$ ths of the remainder, or the whole, which in any given year might be received, will be about 5360*l.*, in all 7086*l.*; but of this 5500*l.* were to be paid over to the Commissioners, leaving for the episcopal income 1585*l.*; true, if a bishop were to live the cycle of years, and *their returns had been rightly calculated*, he would have the average income; but how are his expenses to be paid during this year? Durham, whose riches are proverbial, has a clear uniform income, we suppose, according to the returns, of 10,820*l.*; but of this 9,800*l.* is to be paid to the Commissioners, leaving to the bishop a fixed income of 520*l.*; if the same ratio were taken, the fluctuating income of this far-famed bishopric might be 5567*l.*, in all 6087*l.*; so again,

Winchester, fixed income, £5700—3600 to the fund = 2100	varying	3115	= £5215
Worcester £3390—2300 = 1090		1816	= £2906
Bath and Wells £2755—1000 = 1755		1568	= £3323

The sums to be paid are fixed in an order in council, which appeared in the "Gazette," July 18, 1837, inserted in the Brit. Mag. No. 69, p. 317.

† Report I. states, that "the unavoidable expenses attending the appointment of bishops are so considerable, that they may be calculated at the income of one whole year in most of the sees, and at much more than a year's income in the smaller."—p.9. The Bishop of Ely, in the first year, in which he was to have paid 5500*l.*, received only 2900*l.* or 3000*l.* (*Correspondence*, p.37.)

richly endowed by pious munificence, and the hardship thus inflicted will be thought no more of than the heavy expenses on entering upon preferment,—a sort of necessary evil.

The larger cycle, moreover, necessary for an average, where much of the income is derived from estates out on lives, entails further evil; for at the age at which persons are ordinarily raised to the episcopal office, it is highly improbable that they should possess the see during the years which complete the cycle. The see then (supposing always that the calculation has been just) will retain the average allotted to it by the act of parliament; the bishops will not, but by haphazard; one, it may be, a great deal more, another as much less. And this is the regulation of a Commission, instituted to provide for the “equalizing” of the incomes of the bishoprics. Supposing the principle admitted, that the richer sees might pay over a proportion of their income to the poorer, still the only tolerably equitable way was, that each see retaining the income fixed should pay over the surplus, whatever it might be. Whatever this sum was to be, was (if equitably obtained) an increase to the poorer bishoprics; and as long as their income was helped out by the unobjectionable annexation of cathedral preferment, the uncertainty could have had no ill effects. They were, *pro tanto*, better off than before. But as soon as the plan of the Commission was changed, and the 30,000*l.* per annum of settled income, which they derived from cathedrals, at once detached, the poorer bishoprics became almost wholly dependent on the richer, upon which they were billeted; and so a fixed income for them was settled upon, at the expense of plain injustice and inequality to the richer sees. The bishoprics which had been endowed and were now plundered, thus changed places with those which had not been endowed, or had been plundered: for the fixed income, even if somewhat smaller, is obviously far better than the larger, which, varying widely, is still charged with an uniform heavy stipend. The Commission had recommended two things wholly incompatible; that the richer sees should retain a certain settled income, 8000*l.*, 7000*l.*, 5500*l.*, or 5000*l.*, and yet out of a varying income pay a certain fixed stipend.

There was also this additional hardship, who was to calculate the income? For instance, the income of Bath and Wells for the three years preceding 31st December, 1831, was returned at 5946*l.*; the future net income calculated at 5500*l.* This was admitted even in Report II., and consequently it was not reduced: then, in Report III., it was reduced to 5000*l.*; and this is fixed by the Act. But the Commissioners have the power of settling the fixed sum; and so to reduce to 5000*l.* an income calculated and admitted at 5500*l.*, his majesty in council was advised to order

it to pay 1000*l.* per annum. Again, after the several reductions in the impost laid upon the see of Ely, the Bishop to the last contended* (and it seems justly), that even this lowered demand would not leave the income prescribed by the act, yet it was recommended to his majesty in council, and gazetted, and became law.

The Commissioners were evidently forced on to this step reluctantly. We mention it only as an instance of the cruelty and arbitrariness involved in rapid, ill-digested, and theoretic measures, plans upon paper without adequate information.

It is obvious that, in changing the dioceses, the canonical obedience of the clergy was changed too; this might certainly occasion difficulties in scrupulous minds: "Is my allegiance indeed changed, because the bishop to whom I have sworn obedience is worked upon to give me up, and another as unwillingly receives me?" The difficulty, however, was certainly not diminished by a provision in Report III. stating that it would be

"*Necessary* for his majesty in council to declare that those places which may have been transferred from one diocese to another, shall be subject to the jurisdiction of the bishop of the diocese of which they will then form a part, in all respects and in the same manner as if they had originally belonged to it; and that the jurisdiction of the bishops, from whose dioceses they may respectively have been severed, shall from thenceforth wholly cease."

But this provision completed the Erastian character of the Episcopal Commission. Henceforth, the state is to determine to whom the canonical obedience of the clergy is due. The Episcopate is the creature of the state, to be modelled, re-modelled, or broken in pieces, as it wills.

The **FOURTH REPORT**, the supplement of the second, recommends little new as to the *English* Chapters, or, rather, retards the date of their reduction to the new dimensions, but it brings forward, for the first time, the *Welsh* Chapters. These are among the oldest institutions of the country; the cathedral of Bangor the very oldest. In the Second Report it was said, page 9—

"The Cathedral and Collegiate Churches of the dioceses in the principality of Wales are, in some respects, so peculiarly circumstanced, as to require that they should be treated in a somewhat different manner from the other Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, although without departing from the main principles laid down in this Report."

The fourth Report is curious then, in this respect, as showing what the Commissioners look upon, as the "main principles of

* Correspondence, pp. 53, sqq.

the Report;" evidently this, to reduce the cathedrals as low as can be done, and to confiscate the remainder of their property, and not to attend to any thing peculiar in their respective cases. The consideration of these Chapters had been delayed on account of their peculiar circumstances; yet, when considered, they are all subjected to the same rigid law, all brought to the scale of a dean and *two* canons each; to serve, we suppose, as Carlisle did on the present occasion, as a model for future Commissioners, in the further reduction of English chapters. At least, we cannot discover any other ground why, if *four* canons are necessary for England, the Welsh chapters should be reduced to *two*, and the rest of their property confiscated; nor what ground can be alleged why, if these plans succeed, Carlisle may not be brought down to the reduced St. Asaph, as well as Canterbury to Carlisle. We must, then, think that this precedent is *the* recommendation.

In other respects, the fourth Report is principally, though painfully interesting, for the picture it gives of the unsettledness of the Commissioners' plans, and the utter absence of data, amid which they rush on to these tremendous changes. The absence of inquiry is admitted in the very opening sentence. They say—

"Under that head of our second Report which relates to Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, so many points are comprised, affecting a variety of interests, rights, and customs, that it is scarcely possible to lay down any general scheme, which may not be open to some objections, and into which it may not be necessary, upon further inquiry and consideration, to introduce some alterations."

The "multitude of points comprised, affecting a *variety* of interests, rights, and customs," would apparently have been a sound reason for not embracing all in one sweeping change; it is the very argument used by the chapters, why (if any change in the present system was contemplated) all should not be "dealt with" in one and the same way; why inquiry should precede legislation, not legislation inquiry. So also it might, perhaps, have appeared to the Commissioners, had they not committed themselves in the first instance, to the wholesale innovations of the second Report; now it appears only as a witness against themselves, as an answer to detailed objections, and as a reason for putting off the evil to a distant day, by making it over to the "permanent Commission."

Another change would give incidentally a reprieve to the chapters, while it discovers the hastiness of Report II. After the plan for the extinction of the vacant stalls was promulgated, some one must have suggested that, at this rate, not one of the present

generation, not already possessed of these dignities, could look for them, and the ministers of the Crown would lose this species of patronage. Accordingly, a slower scale of reduction was proposed, which should be "more equitable, as regards both the *patrons of cathedral dignities*, and the clergy who may reasonably look to that kind of preferment:"—for ever the patrons, the rights of patrons, the interests of patrons, those who may "reasonably look to" this patronage, as if patrons and patronage, and selfish interests were the only objects of attention in a Christian Church, while the cathedrals themselves are allowed to decay! However, the respite was welcome, come whence it may; only it is strange that a thing so obvious should not have occurred before; as, amid all this sadness, it is an amusing instance of haste, that this Report makes an express provision for the mode in which the chapter of Christ Church in Oxford should be reduced; whereby, out of eight canonries, four are to be suppressed, in order to leave six (Prop. 4.)

All, however, was not retrograde in this Report, even as to the English chapters. On the contrary, there are indications of the gradual creeping on of the destructive system. Report I. recommended the annexation of an important parish to a stall at Westminster, and the subdivision of that stall, but no confiscation; on the contrary, it pointed out the advantage of these stalls being held with bishoprics, thereby enabling them "to part with some, or all, of their impropriations." Report II. recommended the confiscation of eight out of the twelve stalls at Westminster, and the subdivision of one more for a like object with the first; and the similar employment of "*some of the better endowed canonries, which will remain in four or five of the Cathedrals.*" Report IV. takes away the limitation, and recommends "that power be given to unite *such of the better-endowed canonries* in the *respective* chapters, as may be deemed properly available for the purpose, with the parochial charge of populous districts within the dioceses" (Prop. 35.) This might have been foreseen; but any one had been thought a "prophet of ill," who had said that it would have come so rapidly; by this act the chapters are virtually annihilated; power is claimed to seize on the remaining fragments of the Cathedrals, for the *one* end of providing a parochial ministry; the better-endowed stalls are to be subdivided, and charged with payments; so that a canon should be "a person with the care of an over-peopled district, and a reduced income, insufficient to provide assistant curates, and the charge of maintaining

* Lord J. Russell goes further, "There will be a certain number—but at the same time, a *very small number*—of canonries left, in which the only service to be performed will be the cathedral service, quite unconnected with other duties" [of ~~annexed~~ parishes or an archdeaconry.]—July 8, 1836, *Mirr. of Parl.* 2281.

two houses." Henceforth there would be two classes only in the Church, the bishop and the parochial minister.

Consistent with this is another change from Report II. In Report II. it was proposed that

"No appointment should be made to any of the stalls of the old foundation, which are not residentiary, with the exception of some, the income of which is little more than nominal, and which perhaps it may be deemed expedient to retain, as marks of distinction to be bestowed on deserving clergymen."

This exception, we understand, would have saved a large majority of these pieces of preferment, (whose value, in this particular way of expressing the regard of a bishop for a deserving clergyman, is very great,) most, probably, except some of those, for the sake of which this regulation was probably made, those of St. Paul's. All those, *e. g.*, of Exeter would have been preserved.* But Report IV., without alleging any new ground, to simplify matters, one must suppose, and save inquiry, abolishes all these offices, whose utility Report II. had recognized. It occurs simply among the Propositions (Prop. 29),

"That no new appointments be made to *any* of the prebends, dignities, or offices, not being residentiary, except as herein specified; nor to the Deanery of Wolverhampton."

The finances of the Commission are, we understand, at a low ebb; and this might be inferred from another recommendation of Report IV., "that measures be taken by the said Commissioners for the disposal of the residence houses of the (confiscated) prebends" (Prop. 34). It would otherwise hardly have been proposed that houses within the precincts of a close, or the walls of a college, should have been sold, to become in time, as they passed from hand to hand, taverns or gaming-houses.

One more change in this Report seems necessary to complete the picture; that of the destination of the sum to be obtained from these confiscations. The Second Report had named two classes; 1st, what are commonly called small livings, *i. e.* livings small in income, but often in population also, yet, on the whole, livings with inadequate incomes; 2dly, livings, often well-endowed, but where, through the dense increase of population, the single church stands but as a witness that we acknowledge a God, whom we do not worship; in a word, the overgrown masses of our large towns, where one clergyman has the care of some tens of thousands. Of these, Report II., (as the most compendious method) took account of the former only; it proposed a plan, (with a proviso that it was not to be looked upon as *the* settled

* Second Exeter Memorial, Chapter Memorials, p. 88. They have a fixed income, 20*l.* per annum.

plan,) whereby "all livings of a population from 300 to 500 should be raised to 150*l.*; from 500 to 2000 to 200*l.*; from 2000 to 5000 to 300*l.*; from 5000 and upwards to 400*l.* per annum; this plan was carried out in detail as to the different dioceses;" it was shown how much should accrue to each class as a whole and in each diocese. It was, indeed, implied that the whole sum to be obtained from the cathedrals would not suffice for this; since all they hoped to obtain ultimately from the abolition of the 432 offices, and the abstraction of the estates of the remainder, was 125,357*l.* per annum,* and this plan alone would require 276,641*l.*; and so it was suggested, that—

"Benefices in public patronage, were, in the first instance, the preferable objects of assistance from the funds, which we propose to make available to the purposes of augmentation."

These would require, on this plan, only 145,195*l.* per annum; still, somewhat more than what they thought might be abstracted from the cathedrals and the sinecure rectories. Thus, then, expectations were raised; though the plan was stated not to be fixed upon, nay, that the Commissioners had not fixed upon even "the general principles of distribution," still all this detail showed that it was *a* plan entertained; it was ready calculated how much each class of livings in each diocese was to have, and each clergyman in either of these classes was taught to calculate how much he might obtain of his neighbour's goods. The Fourth Report sweeps all this away; it rightly gives a preference to the wants and circumstances of the places in which the revenues accrue;—an alteration intended to meet some objections made by the chapters, of the injustice of the measure to the places whose impropriations they held, but which (as we shall show) the chapters themselves could have executed much better,—and then proposes that the rest should be applied to "making *additional provision* for cure of souls, in parishes where such assistance is most required;" accordingly to the second class only. The former plan was indeed altogether a wasteful one; it frittered away, for the most part, the sums so dearly obtained, verifying the old saying, "ill-got, ill-spent;" but a change so total, in a plan put out a few months before, betrays the precipitancy with which the plans of the Commissioners had been conducted.

Such was the close of the *genuine* acts of the *second* commission. Shortly after the appearance of this Fourth Report, which

* The estimate of Report II. has been taken. A few months later, Lord J. Russell, a Commissioner, calculated it at 120,494*l.* (July 8, 1836, *Mirror of Parl.* 2281). There is much reason to believe even this exaggerated. "That any such sum will be available for purposes of augmentation, the experience of Boards and Commissions forbids us to expect."—*Archdeacon Thorp's Charge*, p. 16. The sinecure rectories, valued at 8894*l.* per annum, are here omitted.

had not yet reached many of the chapters, the delegates of chapters, assembled in London to remonstrate collectively against the second, which had reached them recently, were informed in answer to their suggestions, that the Commissioners regarded themselves as "*functi officio*;"* they could not entertain their complaints; they had no power; their work was done.

Before proceeding further, then, it is well to sum up what *this* Commission had done; what it had left unfinished. With regard to bishoprics, it had had two points in view, to equalize their size and, within certain limits, their incomes: for the size, they had proposed a large scheme, whose details they have not yet filled up, whereby they prospectively abolished three bishoprics, erected two, and changed the boundaries of all but three.† They did this in a general way; but so little has it been liked by the whole of their brethren, that they have been obliged, in almost every instance, to wait for the death of the existing bishops, in order to effect their scheme. *They have forced a re-modelled episcopacy, against the concurrence of their brethren, upon the whole Church.* Had the present bishops approved of the scheme, it might, thus far, have been effected at once; but the whole is made over to a permanent Commission, to dismember the dioceses, as they became deprived of their bishops, because the present bishops do not come into the scheme, but it has been forced upon them by the civil power. In consequence, it has not been done once for all; the powers granted to the new Commission are sufficient to enable them, provided they retain the *number* of the English dioceses, to remodel the dioceses further, as they will. Thus it has unsettled the territorial jurisdiction of the bishops, and has not resettled it.

With regard to the revenues of the bishoprics, their independence is gone. The new Commission has received and claimed the power of selling estates of individual bishops, as it pleases; of exacting an annual payment, which shall not leave to the bishop thus compelled to pay, the annual sum which they covenanted that he should retain. The property of the bishops, as well as the extent of their dioceses, is in the hands of the Commissioners, no longer in themselves. The precedent has been set, that parliament shall decide the extent of the bishop's incomes; what this will mean hereafter, any one may know; the radical party has already habituated itself to speak of "paying bishops," "granting to bishops,"‡ to except against the "largeness of the

* At least, so it was stated to the delegates by a noble earl, uncontradicted, in the presence of his colleagues. This is mentioned also by Dr. Spry, p. 8.

† Bath and Wells, Chichester, Exeter.

‡ "The public, I repeat, will not be satisfied with such an arrangement as that which gives 15,000*l.* a-year to one bishop, 8000*l.* to another, 7000*l.* to another, 5000*l.* to another, and so on. Why this is the way to keep the whole bench in a constant

sums which they vote to bishops ;" because the property which the state never gave, has been submitted to the revision of the state, without any previous consultation of the Church.

The bribe held out by Lord J. Russell to the refractory adherents of his party, was this :*—

" It does involve a very great measure of reform in the Church ; and it does, *above all, assert an important principle*, so strongly deprecated by the honourable baronet, the member for Oxford, namely, *that parliament has a right to deal with its revenues, and to superintend their distribution.*"

True, that some who wished for more, were not satisfied, because this was not *expressed* in the bill, and said that they had not gained even thus much ; yet when the time shall come, every one knows that these expressions will be forgotten, and the pre-

state of pecuniary independence [*sic*], which cannot but be injurious to the character of the hierarchy and clergy generally, in the estimation of the country !" — Mr. Hume's Speech, July 14, 1836, *Mirror of Parl.* p. 2380. " For a bishop, I think, 4500*l.* a-year ought to be sufficient ; the extra 500*l.* a-year would form a surplus, from which spiritual aid might be provided for 136,000 of his majesty's subjects." — Mr. R. Wynn, *ib.* 2284. " Before we consent to assign the sum of 15,000*l.* to the Archbishop of Canterbury, 10,000*l.* to the Bishop of London, and 8000*l.* to another prelate, we ought to assure ourselves, that we have money enough left to make the provision necessary for the inferior clergy." — Mr. F. Buxton, *ib.* 2287. " The sum of 4594*l.* is to be given to a dean in one place." — *Id.* *ib.* 2288. " It is beginning at the wrong end to make a provision for the bishops before any other consideration." — *Ib.* In like way Mr. Poulter, p. 2289. Mr. C. Buller speaks of " erecting two new bishoprics," and apparently thinks it monstrous, " in the 36th year of the 19th century of the Christian era." " You are going to make two bishops with this surplus property. It may be necessary and important to make two bishops ; but I say it is a million times more necessary and more important to give powerful assistance without loss of time, to the spiritual wants of the working classes of the diocese." — Mr. Lambton, *ib.* 2349. " With all this staring them in the face, they give to the dean of Durham ten times more than the dean of Chester, and they also leave three or four large livings above 3 or 4000*l.* a-year untouched." — *Ib.* [There is in the diocese of Durham only one living above 4000*l.* a-year, and two others only above 2000*l.*, Bishops' Wearmouth, 2899*l.*, and Houghton, 2157*l.*; but this only illustrates how vaguely people speak, and does not affect the principle.] " Some mode must be adopted of relieving the Dissenters from the payment of churchrates, before I, for one, can consent to vote for a bill, which confers a salary of 15,000*l.* a-year upon the Archbishop of Canterbury, and salaries amounting in some instances to 7000*l.* upon the bishops. Nothing can tend so much to aggravate the feelings of the Dissenters, as to see an overpaid hierarchy out of the rates (!) to which they unwillingly contribute." — Mr. Lennard, *ib.* 2378. " I only wish them [the government] to follow up this principle [the appropriation of cathedral property] and to see whether it be consistent to grant large incomes to the bishops and archbishops, without regard to the possible creation of a surplus for the creation of new preferments." — Mr. Poulter, *ib.* 2378. " The bill will leave 150,000*l.* of the public money (for such I will call it) to be appropriated to the bishops." — Mr. Hume, *ib.* 2462. " The legislature refused to give 50,000*l.* for the general education of the poor in Ireland without any religious distinction, but they will not refuse to give 150,000*l.* a-year to twenty-eight [twenty-six] bishops in England." — Mr. Baines, *ib.* 2545.

As if there were something infectious in the tone of that assembly, even Sir R. Peel speaks " of the emoluments to be attached to the office of bishops" (*ib.* 2580), while Lord Melbourne, it is right to state, in the House of Lords, placed the question on its right footing (*ib.* 2608).

* *Mirr. of Parl.* 1836, p. 2465.

cedent urged. The changes contemplated, even when they included some as yet averted, were avowedly accepted, and in one case, by one of no low station,* as an instalment.

The precedent also set in this case, with regard to the bishops' estates, applies apparently to the utmost extent *à fortiori* to the inferior clergy. Let these look to themselves in time. The paramount authority of the state, as involved by this act of the Commission, has already been asserted in high quarters, by a Commissioner and a Bishop† highly respected.

"It has been said that the Commissioners, by their recommendations, have sanctioned the principle, that the state can at will re-distribute the revenues of the clergy. I answer that this principle was assumed in the very terms of the Commission. They could not stir one step towards the fulfilment of the purposes for which they were appointed, without recommending a change in the distribution of some portion or other of the ecclesiastical property."

Had this been so, the blame would be removed not to "those who advised the formation of the Commission" (for these were laymen), but from the specific recommendations of the bishops, to their consenting to act upon the commission at all. They alone are responsible for the Commission, for without them it could not have had effect. The Commission, however, left the bishops free to settle their incomes among themselves;‡ it did not require five to proceed independently of the rest. These five made that a measure of state, which, had they acted in concert with their brethren, would have been a measure of the Church; they, for the first time, in the English branch of the Church Catholic, sanctioned the principle that "the state can, AT WILL, re-distribute the revenues of the clergy."

The state was not referred to, as in former times, to give the force of law to the decisions of the Church; it was referred to as *the* tribunal, and it will treasure up the precedent. Unless a firmer tone be somewhere taken, what now seem to some the ludicrous claims of revolutionists, will soon become the received maxims of politicians. We have seen already how maxims creep gradually upwards, from the extreme to the middle, and from the middle spread through the whole political frame.

* Lord Howick, *ib.* 2543; Dr. Lushington, 2544; Mr. Grote, *ib.* 2542; and Mr. Villiers, *ib.* 2545.

† Bishop of Lincoln's Charge.

‡ "To effect this object (equalizing, in some degree, the episcopal incomes), if all the bishops had been, as I think they ought to have been, called into consultation for the common good, some plan of internal arrangement might surely have been devised, by which the necessities of the poorer might have been supplied out of the abundance of the richer sees, without resorting to parliamentary interference of so extended a nature."—*Mr. Benson's Letter to Bishop of Lincoln*, p. 11.

A portion of the House of Commons has already shown its inclination to carry out these principles; and the Commissioners have abandoned, or rather undermined, the strong ground of property, and taken up with the weak and indefensible post of patronage; they can no longer consistently maintain that a parish is to remain endowed, because former piety endowed it, but simply, because the nomination has been entrusted to a given individual, and he has been hitherto permitted to make that nomination marketable. Even this would only apply to that proportion of livings which is in private patronage, (for the independence of episcopal and chapter and corporate property, and crown patronage, they have given up,) and for these, what stand could be made on such a questionable and often-abused power, as that of selling the nomination to cure of souls? This was a valuable and important *trust*, but ought never to have been made marketable *property*; and great evils, and much impediment to good, have resulted from it. What stand then, we ask again, can be made upon this, after the sacredness of endowments in behalf of particular places or ends, to which donors consecrated their property, has been abandoned? What can be said to such as urge*

“Why are not some of the larger livings—livings enormously disproportionate to the services required—to be reduced to the limits of a fair and moderate income? for it is not one of the least singular of the omissions in these Reports—that not a syllable is said of Stanhope, or Bishop’s Wearmouth, or of the numerous other preferments, which, instead of being a support, are the bane and ruin of the Church.”

We should answer at once, because the endowments have been given to these places and not to others; we should hold that such endowments are responsible, to the fullest extent, for providing for the spiritual wants of their whole districts, and that this might be enforced far more than at present, but that it were wrong and robbery to abstract any of the endowments for other places. But what answer could be given on the principles of this commission? We are sure, none! The abstraction of the property of the cathedrals is a precedent for the spoliation of every endowment in the kingdom. If the ground of patronage be allowed to weigh, it will only be because the patrons are the legislators; it will abide a struggle, no more than the rights of the patrons of parliamentary boroughs; which also were marketable property.

* Mr. F. Buxton (*Mirr. of Parl.* 1836, p. 2287, 8). Bishop’s Wearmouth is a singular instance to give, because, though its annual value is 2,899*l.*, its population was in 1831, 16,590; 516*l.* per annum is already paid to curates; such a parish should have sixteen clergymen at least; and then how large would be even on their estimate the disposable surplus? Would an endowment, which provided a pastor for each 1000 of the flock, be indeed a bane to the Church? The redistribution of livings was spoken on also by Mr. Lampton, *ib.* 2340, Mr. Robinson, 2379, Mr. Lennard, 2462, Mr. Hume, 2540.

There can be no tenable medium between the assertion of the sacredness of endowments for the purposes to which they were given, and of the inherent right of those bodies or individuals to whom they have been entrusted, (except in unforeseen cases which are plainly understood to be exceptions,) and that of the absolute controul of the present generation over the whole.

"I could understand," says Mr. Buxton*, "how a defence of this state of things might be set up upon the ground taken by the honourable member for Oxford University, (Sir R. Inglis, who had maintained the principles here advocated,) but I *cannot* understand, I confess, how those who do believe that the legislature has a right to deal with Church property, for the purpose of making it effectually conduce to the religious instruction of the people, can consent to leave the matter, as it will be left by this bill, with all those great evils totally neglected."

And yet throughout the debates on this subject, except Sir R. Inglis and Mr. A. Trevor, even those who were disposed for the time to think some ecclesiastical property sacred, could devise no other ground than that of private patronage. The principles of these recommendations, carried as they have been, are sufficient to unsettle the whole arrangement of endowments in the kingdom, and to throw the whole into the power of parliament.

We may sum up this argument with Mr. Benson's† strong but unhappily too just expostulation with a Commissioner.

"I feel, my lord, that this detail of the provisions of the act is tedious, but I fear that it is fatally instructive. For what possible interference with ecclesiastical persons and property can the parliament hereafter propose, for which they may not find a precedent in the conduct of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners themselves? Is it thought fit to reduce two dioceses into one? The Commissioners have sanctioned not only the power but the right of the legislature to effect it, and they have said nothing *which should make it necessary at the same time to create a new one*. Is it deemed expedient to revise, alter, and reduce the scale of payment to the said bishops? Parliament may do it for its own purposes, for the Commissioners have required them to do it for theirs. Do they wish to remove a bishop from his habitation or transfer some of his real estates? What should hinder them from performing at their own will, what for the will of the Commissioners they have already agreed to? And what should hinder them from continually requiring all sorts of returns of property, its value, its title-deeds, its securities? The Church Commissioners have taught the principle, by giving to parliament the occasion of intermeddling with ecclesiastical property in the most extensive degree, and searching into it in the most inquisitorial manner. They have by their example instructed the legislature to change, buy, sell, tax, and borrow money upon, the possessions

* *Mirr. of Parl.* 2463.

† Letter to the Bishop of Lincoln, pp. 7, 8.

of the Church, and to set up a board, and a secretary, and clerks and officers for the purpose, and pay them, as it would seem probable, out of the very possessions which are to be so deranged. That is, the Commissioners have led the way for the love of patronage to exercise itself, and shown how the newly-created situations may be paid without appealing to a public, which is wisely not willing of itself to pay for such things.

“ They have, in fact, destroyed one of the best securities for the permanency of ecclesiastical property, the undisturbed antiquity of its title, and the long prescription it has enjoyed. They have placed it, at least the episcopal possessions, upon a purely parliamentary foundation. Henceforth every bishop must plead his right to what he retains or receives as the revenues of his office, not upon what his predecessors for time immemorial had by ancient custom held as their sacred portions, but upon a statute of yesterday. The statute of William IV. cap. 77, is now the basis of their possessions, a basis which the hands that placed in the past year, may in the very next disturb or remove.”

It is worth while to hear, on these changes, the concurring sentiments of two very opposite persons, the one in fruitless warning, before the bill confirming these changes was passed, the other in insulting triumph after it had passed.

The first were the simple words of the late straight-forward and amiable Bishop of Hereford,* verifying the remark how far-sighted single-hearted simple-mindedness often is.

“ I believe that the effect of the bill will be, to render the clergy mere stipendiaries of the state. Although such a proposition is not positively advanced in the bill, I believe it must follow as a necessary consequence: for the man who is not at liberty to hold and administer his property himself, but is amenable to a tribunal, which has the power to examine into the amount of his property, and say to him, “ Beyond this you must not go ; deliver the rest to me : ” such a man I cannot conceive to be in any other state than that of a dependent person. I would ask, is that the intention of the Church Commissioners ? But I will refrain from going further : seeing the opinion is held by a large majority, or rather nearly the entire of your lordships’ House.—I shall only observe, that I feel this bill to be a blow struck at the Church, from the effect of which, if carried, I fear it will never recover.”

The taunt came, not from a radical, but from a minister of the crown, whose spoliation in the matter of church-rates was being resisted. He contended, (and truly enough, in as far as it was not a question of sacrilege,) that he was but acting on the precedent set him.†

“ They who oppose the present proposition stand upon the principle Mr. Burke declared for, ‘ that Church property ought to be as secure in its enjoyment by those who hold it, as any private property is in private

* Debate on second reading, *Mirr. of Parl.* p. 2610.

† Debate on Church Rates, May 23.

hands.' In the general proposition I fully agree. But this is not the case *at present*: this is not the character they *now* have. This character with its *disadvantages*, has *of late* been essentially changed by acts of parliament, *passed last year*, and by various orders in council following each other, I had almost said, day after day, and one of which, I believe, has issued this very day. It is only this very day, I think, by an order in council, you make this proposition to a bishop, 'If your income is more than parliament has declared it ought to be, you shall pay a certain sum to the Chancellor of the Exchequer; if your revenue be less, we, or rather the Commissioners, are to pay you a certain sum, equivalent to the difference between the amount so fixed and the annual receipt.' So that the fixed sum or income, whether it be 4000*l.*, 5000*l.*, 6000*l.*, or 8000*l.*, will be what *parliament* or the Church Commissioners shall have determined on as the *proper* sum to be paid. This arrangement having once been made, the whole argument as to the *independent* character of the bishops, of which we have heard so much, and as to their *being proprietors of the land*, is at an end."

But neither is this arrangement final; the Commissioners in that they exceeded the bounds of their Commission, and recommended that no canonry or deanery should be held with a bishopric, rendered any final arrangement impossible. They reduced the sum total of virtual episcopal income far below what it had been wont to be; and what it was, they had over-estimated. The smaller bishoprics had mostly been supported by the cathedral preferment held by the bishops; this they struck off, imagining that by a re-distribution, they might attain an adequate income. But in the very first case, in which they attempted to apply their scale of reduction, they failed. After reducing their claim from 5500*l.* per annum (Report II.) to 5000*l.* (Report III.), they were brought down to 4000*l.* and an estate, (then worth 4000*l.*, and ultimately 6000*l.*); then to 2500*l.*, leaving the estate to the see; and finally waiving the first year's payment; and this last sum did not leave for the expenses of the bishop, for the first year of his episcopacy, more than 3000*l.** The result is, that in commercial language, the Commission is already bankrupt; it was obliged to deduct a per-centage from the allowances to which it

* See "Correspondence between the Ecclesiastical Commissioners and the Bishop of Ely." The peremptory tone, however, taken throughout, and especially at the close, on the part of the Commissioners, makes what the Bishop of Exeter mentioned as "possible," seem to us any thing but improbable, if but time be allowed, and the Commission passes gradually into other hands, "that the Commissioners might recommend some scheme, which would destroy the independent character of the clergy, and make them stipendiaries of the state; and that measures might be proposed, which would enable the Commissioners absolutely to grasp the whole of the Church lands and estates. I consider that to be possible, but I do not think it is gravely intended by the present Commissioners that such schemes should be proposed."—*Mirr. of Parl.* 2610.

was pledged; and in one case, in which the increased travelling expenses were allowed to a bishop, who had yielded to their urgency, and allowed the size of his see to be doubled (we are speaking, of course, only of notorious facts), this per-centage was deducted not only on the allowance made, but on the whole income of the see. Credit thus failing, must needs be propped up in some fresh way: in other words, neither in this respect are the recommendations of the Commission final. Other innovations must be resorted to, if the present is to be carried through.

The precedent of a gradual enlargement of the bounds within which the Commission is to act, has been already set in the cases of York and Bath and Wells, and is the more formidable from its very gradualness. It is true, that a certain portion of ground only has been secured by the act of parliament; only the sees named therein are for the present liable to have their incomes re-adjusted by the Permanent Commission; but since our bishops now hold their property only by permission of parliament, what is to hinder, as revenues diminish, the same process being applied to Lichfield and Coventry, now estimated at 4350*l.*, Lincoln 4200*l.*, Norwich 4700*l.*, Salisbury 5000*l.*, so as to bring them down to the proposed minimum of 4000*l.*? It were a tolerable evil, though a very mournful one, to see an act of violence perpetrated once for all; if our house is robbed once for all, we know the extent of the loss; but to live in a constant state of insecurity, or rather to know that our foundations of all sorts are in a constant state of insecurity, that not only an act has been committed, but a principle sanctioned, whose application has been gradually extended, and which may creep on, like the leprosy on the walls, around all our hallowed foundations, this opens a prospect indeed miserable!

The measures as to the chapters may be summed up more briefly; by way of destruction well nigh every thing was done; by way of setting up, nothing; the whole disposition of the calculated 130,000*l.* per annum, was left to the Standing Commission, i. e. to the minister of the day, to parcel out as he thinks fit; no one limitation made, except that

“The property and revenues rendered available by these alterations, should, after due [?] consideration of the wants and circumstances of the places in which they accrue, be applied to the purpose of making additional provision for the cure of souls in parishes where such assistance is most required, in such manner as shall be most conducive to the efficiency of the Established Church.”

What security this would be, when it is held that a (professed) member of the Established Church cannot mean any harm to it;

that consequently Romanists, though they have sworn to do nothing to subvert the Established Church, may join in measures which they see to be destructive to it, if but a professed member of the Church proposes them; when, for the civil power to abolish ten bishoprics at a stroke, is for the interests of the Established Church; to abolish church-rates is for the interests of the Church; to admit persons of any or no religion to our fellowships in the Universities, is for the interests of the Church; what security this clause will be, it needs no diviner to tell. It would be difficult to say what evil might, in certain quarters, *not* be thought for the interests of the Church; but we know that an involuntary poverty, and the loss of her endowments, is held, as a fundamental principle, to be for her interests.

It is difficult also to say, amid the present lax notions about the Church, who (except perhaps the Romanists) might not or would not regard themselves members of the Church for an end. A member of the House of Commons said plainly,

“I, though a member of another religious community, consider myself of the Church of England. Now, if I were appointed, I should like to know whether my appointment would be valid.”†

Neither need we say how injurious it would be to the independence of the Clergy that 130,000*l.* of their annual income should be at the disposal of the minister of the day. It were a worse than voluntary system, it were to make them stipendiaries of a politician. It is bad enough to hear Church patronage spoken of as “oil to grease the wheels of government;” but under that system, the bribe is offered, happily, not to the clergyman, but to his patron; and that system cannot last long; the plan of the Commissioners would make the clergy dependents upon parliament. In proportion as the independence of the clergy has been a blessing to the state as well as to the Church, would this change be miserable.

Equal power is left to the Commission as to the remaining stalls; all the canonries which they think fit for the purpose, are to be placed at their disposal, to divide, subdivide, and annex to populous places. In a word, then, full power is given them to do what they will with the revenues of the dissolved prebends, and with the prebends which remain; but *nothing is done* except to dissolve the one, and give power over the other. The power given is the more fearful, because so unbounded.

In the feeling words of the late lamented Bishop of Hereford,‡

“My feelings are entirely consonant with those of the illustrious duke

* Mr. Benson makes the same remark.—*Letter*, p. 9, 10.

† *Mirr. of Parl.* 1836, p. 2293.

‡ On the motion that the bill do pass.—*Mirr. of Parl.* p. 2741.

(Cumberland)—as respects the bill, now that it has received all the alterations proposed, I still view it with the same misgivings, and the same fears, that it may work ill to the Church.—Those (clergy) with whom I have had the means of communicating personally or by letter, or whose opinions I have ascertained from others, entertain but one common sentiment, and that is a feeling of distrust and dismay. They see that arrangements are made, *under which the property of the Church is to be disturbed, but how it is to be re-settled, they have yet to learn.* There is no legislation in this bill for its future settlement; there is to be a committee for the regulation of the property of the Church, and they are to be bound down to certain points, it is true, but these points are various; and the powers given to the Commissioners are, I conceive, very great and most extraordinary. However, it is not for me to detain the House—but I must relieve my conscience by saying, that I regard the measure with great fear and alarm, and that I have no participation in it.”

The character of the Commission is still further illustrated, by following it from its recommendatory to its legislative period; and that chiefly in two points: 1. The rigour with which all its recommendations were enforced, and no amendment permitted. 2. The manner in which the powers given to the new incorporated Parliamentary Commission were obtained and modified.

1. One should certainly gladly dispense with any interference in the House of Commons on any details of a Church bill, and the side which different parties took in this case, gave an apt illustration how fit they were, impartially to legislate for the Church. Some high-minded Churchmen voted against the bill upon principle; and with these were ranged the Radicals and Dissenters, because they wished to put in a claim for some of the spoils (an early indication of the wisdom of these changes of property): it was supported by the ministers who brought it in, by the Conservatives, because they wished to claim the credit of being Church-Reformers, and by the Papists, because they feared that their patrons would be forced to resign. And thus, though time was demanded by Churchmen on behalf of the Church, as well as by the representatives of the Dissenters, it was hurried through the House of Commons in seventeen days. In the House of Lords, in which, on account of the presence of the bishops, the clergy are in these days thought to be represented, more deliberation might have been expected. But it passed the bill on the tenth day after it was brought in, the eleventh after it left the Commons; four weeks were thought sufficient to pass a bill full of important principles, affecting both the property and the constitution of the Church. It is plain, then, that those who carried it through, did not look upon themselves as legislators, but only as confirming the acts of the Commission. All examination into details was rejected, as a prin-

ciple, in the lower House, by Sir Robert Peel,* as well as by Lord John Russell; in the upper House by the Duke of Wellington.† They were taunted by the ultra section,‡ that the "object of the bill appeared to be to throw the burden of legislation off their own shoulders." This had been right, had the bill emanated from the Church; coming, as it did, from a few bishops, joined on to a decided majority of laymen, it was most unconstitutional; it made the Commission the legislative for the Church. Nay, since it was stated on high authority, that in its later stage the Commission disagreed within itself, a section of the Commission, seven against six,§ was its legislative. Two powerful parties had, however, taken it up; the Conservatives had commenced; the Whigs had built up; neither would lose the credit which they supposed to attach to it, and so even when the flagrant injustice committed on the Isle of Mann was excepted against, but seven persons, five bishops, (the rest of those not on the Commission having, at this late period of the session, returned to their dioceses,) and two laymen, were found to oppose it. The rights of the Isle of Mann were resisted on no other ground than that the Commission was to be taken as a whole. It was thus admitted, that the legislative of the Church was given to a small fraction of the episcopal order, and to the ministers of the Crown. This is the first step towards bringing the Church into a truly Protestant dependence on the state.

2. Still more important, in this point of view, is the constitution given to the Commission, and the way in which it was given. It was, as stated above, for the first time hinted at, and very indistinctly, in the second Report, presented on March 10, 1836. It was first distinctly announced in the third, bearing date May 20, but not its constitution; a similar Commission had been imposed upon Ireland shortly before, "of which *one member only* was removable at the pleasure of the crown;" the third Report recommended the Commission, but not how it should be constituted; its framers, of course, knew that they should be themselves appointed. Further, even in the third Report it was only incidentally conveyed that this Commission was to be perpetual, and that for *one* single purpose, the revision of the episcopal revenues.

* *Mirr. of Parl.* p. 2380.

† On the question of the preservation of the Bishopric of Mann, *Ib.* p. 2634.

‡ As by Mr. C. Buller, *Ib.* p. 2290.

§ "It was quite true, that the Commissioners on some points in their Report, appear to have differed, and to have been so nearly divided, as that the numbers were as six to seven; yet he was entitled to state, that when they were appointed, on the issuing of the Commission, they did not differ in politics; but circumstances had since changed, and with that change of circumstances a division took place between them." *Sir R. Peel's Speech* (as reported by the Standard, July 9, 1836; this part is omitted in the *Mirror of Parliament*, p. 2286).

The Church then had no notice whatever of this frightful power, until within about two months before it was made law, and that through the chance information of newspapers;* there was no time left for thought or consultation; the bishops, "who† both for themselves and the Church were so deeply interested in the bill, *were not allowed even to see it, much less to state any objections to it, before it was introduced into Parliament,*" i. e. four weeks before it was made law. But this was not all; the worst provision was introduced on the ipse dixit of Lord J. Russell after the third reading of the bill. Objections had been made to the power given to the Commissioners on two sides; by the Churchmen for the sake of the Church, by the Dissenters lest the Church, as they esteemed it, i. e. lest the ecclesiastical portion of the Commission should be too independent of parliament. "It would," said one, "be worse," [i. e. more independent of parliament,] "than a revival of the House of Convocation." These were to be attended to; and so just at the third reading, Lord J. Russell stated that he intended to propose that "the two archbishops and the Bishop of London and others [the ministers of the crown] should be official Commissioners, but that the bishops last-named in the commission, and the three last-named Lay-commissioners should be removable at the pleasure of the crown." Thus the Commission was placed entirely in the hands of the prime-minister of the day; for while by one clause the presence of *two* bishops was made essential to any recommendation, and thus, we must say cunningly, an appearance was given of "doing nothing without the bishop," another clause provided that *two* bishops of the Commission should be dependent upon the crown; and not this only, but "in case any two episcopal Commissioners, being the only episcopal Commissioners present, should object to the ratification of any such proceeding, such ratification or affixing of the seal shall [only] not take place until a subsequent meeting of the Commissioners shall have been held, after due notice thereof." But in this second meeting, not even the five bishops are entitled to outweigh the minister and his adherents. It is then essentially a political Commission. Nor is even this all. For the bill further provides, that—

"A copy of every order of his majesty in council made under this act, shall be *laid before each House of Parliament*, in the month of January, or within one week after the next meeting thereof."

This altogether harmonizes with a political commission; but whoever has observed how the popular portion of parliament absorbs into itself the controul of every thing laid before it, and

* The British Magazine was not enabled to print the Third and Fourth Reports till August, on the 5th of which this measure passed the House of Lords.

† Bishop of Exeter's Charge, p. 25.

that this was the especial wish of the ultra-section in that House,* may well shrink back from the whirlpool into which our vessel has been drifted.

“Hoc Ithacus velit et magni mercentur Atridæ.”

“The bill being first introduced into the house of Commons, and having there received one of its worst changes—that which made the Commissioners removable at the pleasure of the crown, *avowedly for the purpose of making them more dependent on that House*—when it reached the Lords, but little hope was presented, and so we were expressly told, of effecting any amendment, without insuring the ultimate rejection of the bill itself. For the minister who had introduced it into the House of Commons, is represented to have declined to press the measure in any form which should render it unacceptable to a certain portion of his adherents.”†

We have hitherto been accustomed to look with compassion upon our Irish sister, and not a few remonstrances were made to ministers by the anti-church party, that the two branches of the Church were not placed upon the same footing, and the same measures of “appropriation” dealt to England as to Ireland. In this respect, however, we are “laid in iron” sooner and faster than our sister; perhaps because she was weak, we strong; she therefore was plundered and had but light chains put upon her; we are fettered now, that we may be plundered hereafter. However, so it is, the political character of our “permanent Commission” is a strange contrast even to her’s. This was put to the House by the Bishop of Exeter with his usual force and clearness.‡

“My objection does not rest here,” [that the Commission was made a corporation,] “I object to the composition of the Commission. I put it to you, whether you can find a single instance of the vast majority of a Commission being removable at the pleasure of the crown. But the objection which I feel to the construction of the Commission, does not stop here. The Commissioners being subject to removal at the pleasure of the crown will necessarily become a political body, liable to shift and change with the change of government and the variations of political influence; they will, therefore, be exposed to the temptation of using their power for political purposes. It is only two or three years ago since a similar Commission was created for ecclesiastical offices in Ireland; and I entreat your Lordships’ attention to the composition of that Commission: it consisted of the Lord Primate, the Archbishop of Dublin, four Bishops, the Lord Chancellor, the Lord Chief Justice, and three others, not necessarily lay or clerical; two of whom were nominated by the king’s solicitor or council, and one by the primate. Of all these persons

* See Speeches of Mr. Baines (*ib.* 2542); Mr. Hume, Mr. C. Buller, Mr. Ewart, &c.—p. 2541.

† Bishop of Exeter’s Charge, p. 25.

‡ On the second reading, *Mirror of Parl.* p. 2609.

only two are removable at the will of the government, the Lord Chancellor and the Lord Chief Justice. In selecting the highest judicial functionaries, your lordships will perceive that the motive for so doing was to appoint those least likely to be actuated by political motives. There are four bishops and three others, all of whom hold their places not at the will of the crown, but for life. The Irish Commission was thus rendered independent, which, I think, every Commission of the sort ought to be. This departure, on the part of the present government, from the precedent they so recently established, I confess, does not a little startle me, especially as that precedent seems to be avoided in such a way as to make the ecclesiastical Commissioners totally dependent upon the political influence of the day. I am willing to hope, however, that when the bill goes into the committee, it will receive some improvement in this respect."

But it was in vain, however, that "all the English bishops,* not being members of the Commission, who were able to protract their attendance in parliament to so late a period," opposed it; *sic volo, sic jubeo, stat pro ratione voluntas*. The "minister of the people" in the lower House would only pass the bill if the Commissioners were made dependent; and so through panic, lest the House of Commons should think themselves entitled to dispose of revenues once brought before them, the bill was past, lest it should have again to be submitted to that assembly.†

Thus then the Incorporated Commission was established; its powers were limited as to the subjects only; on these subjects they were unlimited. The Commission had but to make a recommendation to his majesty in council, i. e. *as is always the case*, to his majesty in the presence of the *same Commissioners*; and then the Commissioners having formally advised his majesty to do as they had themselves before-hand recommended to his majesty, the recommendation is gazetted, and becomes law! It was, however, contended that the Commissioners should be limited as to the subjects on which they were to recommend; doubtless they were at first, though even then, as we have seen, within no narrow range; even then the horizon which bounded them was far enough; but who ever reached the horizon? or when was a large machinery ever set up, which was ultimately restrained to the execution of that for which it was primarily designed? It was truly said by one of the most far-sighted minds of this day,‡

"There is in the bill, as it now stands, an inclination to a perpetual change, *because a machinery calculated to produce a perpetual change is to be established.*"

This was said not two years past, yet it was said before any

* Bishop of Exeter's Charge.

† Mirror of Parl. p. 2541.

‡ Bishop of Exeter, Mirror of Parl. l. c. 2609.

symptoms had appeared of intending to commit to the Commission any further offices; it was said while politicians were protesting that the Commission was perfectly safe *because* its objects were limited; and the next year was happily a quiet year for the Church, because it was assailed as a whole; there were no more questions of innovations within it, because there were attacks from without; the fruitless attempt to abolish church-rates, diverted the energy which was employed on re-modelling her; the pressure from without kept peace within.

The "permanent Commission" also was issued, in order to carry into effect the details of such recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry, as could not under the circumstances then be completed; it was a prolonged session of the former Commission to complete such matters, as they did not possess sufficient information, or had not taken time, or which regard to vested rights allowed them not, to complete. There was no reason in the nature of things, why they should not at some period finish their labours, though there was reason enough in human nature to think that a machinery so convenient, and giving such power to the state over the Church, would not be readily broken up. Yet now, at the very commencement of the second session, besides all the fresh powers proposed to be bestowed upon the Corporate Commission, if the bill against the Cathedrals should be carried, large powers are conveyed to it in a bill less likely to be objected to, the Plurality Bill. This extension of power illustrates two points; 1. The inclination to turn over to the Commission every thing connected with the Church; 2. To make it a court of ultimate appeal above the Bishops, and even the Metropolitan himself. It is remarkable, further, that this bill *directly* interferes with the Liturgy, and prescribes the mode of our devotions: a *lay* bill, prepared and brought in by two of the "ministers of the people," prescribes that "in every chapel of the annual value[!] of 150*l.* where the population shall amount to 400, there shall be two sermons, unless the Bishop shall dispense with one;" i. e. a lay bill, brought into a house, where persons of all or no forms of religion are mixed up together, prescribes the duties of the ministers of the Church, does not simply give the Bishop power *legally* to enforce certain points, but changes them itself, peremptorily prescribes two sermons, and virtually proscribes catechizing. And yet there can be no doubt which of the two our Church, and the reformers of our Liturgy preferred; as little is there which will most build up our congregations in the faith: yet now are we to have persons of any or no faith prescribing in these things. "Will ye have the priesthood also?"

This, perhaps, is the most flagrant violation of Church principle in this bill; if we wish to have *civil* authority for any purpose, we must of course come to this assembly; but that this assembly, such as it now is, should assume the initiative in altering the character of the services of the Church, is intolerable. This too is a fruit of the Commission.

Yet neither is it sparing in the details of interference with Episcopal duties, or in assigning a lay authority to which the exercise of his spiritual authority is to be submitted;—regulations in keeping with the only addition made in the House of Commons to the so-called “Established Church Bill,” whereby it was

“enacted that the Commissioners shall prepare such a scheme as shall seem best adapted for preventing the appointments of any clergymen not fully conversant with the Welsh language to any benefice with cure of souls in Wales, where the majority of the inhabitants do not understand English.”

Will the Commissioners have next to prepare a scheme, whereby incompetent persons shall be excluded from the ministry, or will politicians regulate the frequency of our communions, as well as of our sermons, or direct the Bishop as to his confirmations as well as his ordinations? The Plurality Bill shows no inclination to stop short. Thus, if the Bishop of a diocese, or two Bishops of neighbouring dioceses, wish to unite two livings (a power which the Third Report recognises as belonging to the Bishop) the lay Commission is to inquire and to report to her majesty in council (the council being the said Commissioners,) and it is to be *lawful* for her majesty to unite them; i. e. a parliament thus composed is to give her majesty, the head of the Church, power to do an ecclesiastical office, the office of a Bishop; only her majesty is not to have power, except in such cases in “which the parliament recommends:” in like way, if benefices are to be disunited, wholly (§ 14) or partially (§ 16), the said Commissioners are again called in: and in apportioning the endowments are to “consult the patrons,” but not the Bishop (§ 17). The same body is to alter the boundaries of parishes, separate chapels of ease, settle the ecclesiastical jurisdiction, dues, rates, pews, thereon depending, with the Bishop (§ 19), and make supplemental orders without him (§ 20). The same body is to be Archbishop over the Archbishop, for as the Bishop is to transmit copies of certain licenses to the Archbishop, so the Archbishop is to transmit the same, or such as himself grants, to her majesty in council, i. e. to this same body; and there it may be revoked (§ 41); and as he is to decide finally in the cases in which the Bishop remits the fines for non-residence which this Act prescribes, so this body is

to decide as to those in which he (the Archbishop) remits them to his clergy (§ 47); to the same body the Bishop is annually to return lists of residents and non-residents, and also of all cases where he does not exercise the powers now given to him, to require incumbents of incomes above 150*l.* to take up money to build residences (§ 55); or if he do not sequestrate vacant livings whereon there is no residence (§ 67).

A year and a half ago the Bishop of Exeter set forth plainly to his clergy, the character of this invasion of the Episcopal office; his warning, and every word of his, is well known in the quarters whence this bill proceeds; yet after the breathing-time of a year, it is still persisted in. It is in the way, to use his concluding energetic words, "little short of putting the Episcopacy of the Church of England into Commission."*

This is only an earnest of what will be; a legislative is much wanted for the Church, and the want is felt; we have no authoritative canons, no discipline, no means of adapting ourselves to the altered state of society and population,—none of commanding the energies of powerfully-stirred but unregulated minds, which since not employed by the Church are turned against her,—no means of finding nor of securing any adequate knowledge in our candidates for orders,—none of educating the increasing middling classes; and the education of the lower, which, as being less costly has almost alone been attended to, is, on account of our neglect, passing out of our hands; uniformity among the clergy is thought impossible; the solemn worship of our Church is neglected because we have but few daily to offer it. We have our old institutions awakened or awakening from their slumbers, into which they were cast by the Revolution, and diffusing good as far as they extend, but no means of extending their usefulness beyond their present confined limits; on the other hand, we have the fresh activity finding vents for itself, since it is undirected, confusing the Church, if within her, weakening her if without; societies taking the initiative for every purpose under the sun: if the Lord's-day is to be decently observed, we have a society; if animals not to be cruelly treated, a society; if Church-rates to be opposed or defended, a society; if Church-legislation, a lay society; and the ultimate end of these societies is to obtain acts of parliament, instead of canons; societies are our Episcopacy, and newspapers our rules of faith.†

This state of things cannot last without the dissolution of the Church; it can be remedied, under God, only by the Church herself, as His instrument; but remedies or palliatives, for some

* Charge, p. 34.

† See Church of the Fathers in Brit. Mag. Feb. 1858.

things, there must be ; somewhere there must be legislation ; the successive parliaments have, for years, been teeming with legislation for the Church ; and bill after bill has been abandoned from the impossibility of legislating for her there ; both the great political parties are weary of the difficulty, and fear the responsibility (the responsibility alas ! towards men mostly, not towards God) of legislating for the Church ; they would be glad to get rid of it ; the Commission has shown no disinclination to receive multifarious duties ; in a short time, if things go on thus, each ecclesiastical measure will be absorbed into the Commission ; we shall live under the supremacy of the Commission ; it will be our legislative, executive, the ultimate appeal of our bishops ; it will absorb our Episcopate ; the prime minister will be our Protestant pope.

This progress of things is curiously, and it may be for the Church, happily illustrated by the "draft of a Fifth Report prepared by the ecclesiastical Commissioners, and the bill to be founded on it.

It was well known in the course of last year that the Episcopal Commissioners had at last been startled by the attempt on the part of the ministers of the crown to despoil the Church of her property in Church-rates, and to apply to this end part of the chapter property. This was against the compact, upon which the Ecclesiastical Commission was founded, viz. that all the income thence arising should be employed for "the efficiency of the established Church;" now it was to be employed to gratify the political dissenters. The bishops then on the Commission saw, it is supposed, how precarious the tenure of the confiscated property would be, if once in the hands of a body, which the minister of the day could command ; they drew back in time ; refused, it is understood, to sit on the Commission after that time (March, 1837); would proceed no further with the work, and finally left any materials they were employed upon, unfinished ; would not sign them, and allowed the Commission to expire after the demise of the crown, without proceeding further. The Church consequently was re-assured, the cathedrals were regarded as saved ; it was *known* that the Episcopal Commissioners had abandoned all notion of touching the chapters. The episcopal body was now again thus far re-united ; and it is accordingly against the will of the Episcopal Commissioners that Lord John Russell has got possession of this unfinished draft ; it is against the whole Bench of Bishops that he is proceeding with it.

Of the draft itself little need be said ; we are persuaded that it never could have been signed by the bishops, in the state in which

it now is ; it is a naked attempt to bribe the present members of chapters to give up their opposition to the confiscation of the property whereof they are trustees,—in most cases sworn trustees,—by providing for all their selfish interests ; and not only this, but (as they would deserve) they are taunted with the admirable terms, which by their opposition they have obtained for themselves. They, or rather the public, are told

“The effect of the modified proposition which we now offer (*viz.* that the chapter patronage should not be transferred to the bishop ‘until after the expiration of the interest of every existing member’) will be, that while the crown and the bishops will immediately relinquish their right of patronage, with respect to the preferments which it is proposed to suppress, the existing members of the chapter will, during their incumbency, retain theirs with respect to the benefices, the advowsons of which belong to them in their corporate character ; and in some chapters they will enjoy, as the numbers of the canons shall be reduced, an increase of patronage proportionate to that reduction.”

A sentence so flagrantly unjust, and imputing such sordid motives to the members of chapters, could never have received the deliberate sanction of the respected individuals who form the Episcopal portion of the Commission.* They knew that the members of the chapters, as many as did object to this transfer, did not object to it for their own selfish sakes ; they had before them the memorial of the delegates, or members, of nineteen chapters,† in which they professed their willingness to surrender their patronage “if any great good appeared likely to result ;”‡ they knew that of fifteen chapters, who mentioned this subject, one§ only, and that the most yielding as to the future, made any claim on the part of the present prebends ; the grounds of objection were, the arbitrary stretch of authority in touching upon this subject, which had not been included in their Commission ;|| the invasion of rights ;¶ the unjust imputation cast upon the cathedrals, as if they were proved delinquents** or more so than other

* The language remarkably resembles that of Lord John Russell in the debates, July, 25, 1836.—*Mirror of Parliament*, 2539.

† All the English Chapters but York, Hereford, Norwich, Peterborough, and Westminster. The names of those present are given in the *Brit. Mag.*, Aug. 1836.

‡ *Cathedral Memorials*, pp. 3, 4.

§ *Rochester* was willing to relinquish a proportion of its future patronage, supposing the prebends to be suppressed, but claimed it in full for existing members (2d Mem. *ib.* p. 59). *Norwich* and *Salisbury* treat subordinately of the injustice to vested rights, p. 46.

|| *Canterbury Memorial*, *ib.* p. 13 ; *Lichfield*, p. 104 ; *Salisbury*, p. 127.

¶ *Canterbury*, *ib.* p. 14 ; *Carlisle*, p. 24 ; *Norwich*, p. 46 ; *Worcester*, p. 66 ; *Lichfield*, p. 104, *Lincoln*, p. 112 ; *Salisbury*, p. 127 ; *Wells*, p. 136 ; *Windsor*, p. 128.

** *Carlisle*, p. 24 ; *Norwich*, p. 46 ; *Westminster*, p. 69 ; *Exeter*, p. 92 ; *Lincoln*, p. 112 ; *Salisbury*, p. 132.

patrons;* the suspiciousness of the enactments; the tendency to produce heartburnings between orders of men who ought to be united†; *the positive detriment to the Church*, in that this division of patronage was beneficial,‡ and the prebendaries were likely and *had met with*, and placed in spheres of usefulness, valuable men who had escaped the observation of the bishop.¶ They professed also their willingness to place their patronage under stricter regulations, which should guard against occasional abuse.§ They disclaimed insisting on retaining it for their own purposes;¶ they professed to be ready to make personal sacrifices for the public good;** the Chapter of Ely closed their most valuable and impressive remonstrance, with the solemn statement that “being members of an ancient and venerable institution, dedicated to the service of God, they have learnt to regard the permanence of their establishment in efficiency and dignity, with feelings of far deeper interest than their own personal vested rights.” What an answer to this would it have been from bishops, to tell them to “go and be content,” for that “while the crown and the bishops will immediately relinquish their right of patronage,” the existing members of chapters would “*enjoy* an increase of patronage proportionate to the reduction!” happy enjoyment truly, which in former times was held a curse, to be the “last of his race,” and happy recommendation of bishops, as if nepotism was the sole, true, legitimate end of patronage, and they wished to guide the canons to be nepotists! We are convinced that bishops never would have signed such a document as this; we should grieve to be convinced that they ever joined in drawing it up; from statesmen, it would be but the use of their natural and accustomed instrument—corruption; but we should be loath to suppose that any of the spiritual heads of the Church could think so meanly of their brethren, as to deem them accessible to such motives, or thinking them so, should tempt and degrade them, and with them, their ministry, their teaching, and the Church, by appealing to their base and selfish passions.

And yet this is the characteristic of the draft; the chapters had

* Memorials, p. 4; Ely, p. 35; Norwich, p. 46; Worcester, p. 66; Exeter, p. 82; Lichfield, p. 104.

† Deputation, p. 4; Westminster, p. 69; Salisbury, p. 127 & 132.

‡ Deputation, p. 4; Carlisle, p. 24; Exeter, p. 81.

¶ Lincoln, pp. 112, 113; Wells, p. 136.

§ Deputation, p. 4; Canterbury, (provided they applied to all patrons) p. 14; Bristol, p. 17; Ely, p. 32; Westminster, p. 69; Exeter, p. 82 & 92.

¶ Bristol, *ib.* p. 17. “They disclaim all appeal to it as an interest, spiritual patronage was never founded on this principle and ought never so to be possessed, and they would gladly look to the purest and most effective exercise of it.”—*Westminster*, p. 69.

** Bristol, *ib.* p. 17.

collectively, as well as individually, protested against the recommendations of the Commission;* they had all protested against the principle of reduction. Even the prebendaries of Lichfield and Chester, who were to be reduced from six to the received number of four, but on account of the poverty of the foundations to be allowed to retain all their funds, and Lichfield to receive some increase from the non-residentiary stalls, protested against this change, as an injury.† Such chapters as had minor canons, or the minor canons themselves, protested against the arbitrary dissolution of their corporations.‡ Some had specified the injustice of such sweeping measures against the whole chapter body, without, or even refusing, information; had protested against the transfer of property from diocese to diocese, or to places with which their cathedral had no connection, in disregard of the intentions of the founder; against the augmentation of lay and marketable patronage with the spoils of the cathedrals;§ against the wastefulness, precariousness, and injustice of a common fund:|| they had hinted, as respectfully as they might, at the sanction of oaths, whereby their property was guaranteed to them.¶ Some of them had dwelt also on the positive detriment likely to result from the diminution; they had appealed to facts to show that the proposed number of the canons** was inadequate; they had desired to be allowed to give further information;†† they proposed to show a judicious system of annexation,‡‡ together with the augmentations of bene-

* Those of Chester, as a pecuniary injury to themselves; the chapter of Lichfield, on account chiefly of the inefficiency of four, but taking the grounds also of the Memorials from Canterbury, Winchester, Exeter and Salisbury.

† The fullest and most important of these, next to the General Memorial, are those from Canterbury and Ely; but different points are well touched in others, as those of Bristol, Exeter, Lincoln, Westminster, Winchester. Most also supply some useful evidence.

‡ We have noted among the Chapter Memorials the General Memorial, Bristol, Ely, Exeter, Hereford, Lichfield, Lincoln.

§ Gen. Mem., Rochester, Worcester, Exeter twice, Lincoln, Norwich, Oxford. "The dean and chapter most earnestly deprecate the transfer of the revenues of cathedrals to any but their own daughter churches, as subversive of the whole principle of ecclesiastical endowment, and a manifest violation of the known intentions of the founder."—*Lincoln Mem. ib.* p. 45.

|| Gen. Mem., Canterbury, Worcester, Exeter, Lincoln.

¶ Gen. Mem. Canterbury, Bristol, Rochester, Lincoln. The words of the Chapter of Lincoln are again much to be attended to (*Mem.* p. 110, 111): "Setting aside for a moment the question of right to make this transfer, we respectfully urge that, by the raising of all such contributions, the bounty of the founders is pro tanto perverted from its original design; one patron enriched at the expense of another; payments made to the Church in one place applied to spiritual purposes in another; and property concentrated and converted into money; so rendering it less safe from rapacious usurpation than lands scattered and divided committed to the immediate guardianship of several unconnected owners."

** Gen. Mem., Canterbury, Worcester, Exeter, Hereford, Lincoln.

†† See above, Lichfield (p. 103) joins in the same.

‡‡ Gen. Mem., Canterbury, Durham, Ely, Norwich, Rochester, Exeter, Lichfield,

fices of which they held the impropriations.* Some appealed† to what they *had* actually done in behalf of poor or populous parishes connected with them. They were willing to make personal sacrifices, provided they might transmit their numbers undiminished to posterity, and the foundations, whose efficiency it was the professed object of this Commission to promote, might be retained unimpaired. Thus far they had no apparent selfish interest; and we could have wished that they had confined themselves to such topics, and not touched upon what, though equally unjust, was an injustice felt by them as well as their successors; yet they looked upon this in part as spoliation also, in part as casting a stigma upon them; and so they claimed their patronage and the prebendal houses, on the same principle as the rest. The "draft of the Fifth Report" accordingly proposes to concede those things, in which any could be selfishly concerned; but the patronage only so far as they were selfishly concerned, and every thing else, oaths, statutes, wills of founder, their own inherent rights, and the rights of the dioceses, future efficiency of the foundations, petitions for inquiry, are swept away; "they saw no reasons to outweigh those on which they had founded their recommendations."

These concessions to supposed selfishness are a fresh aggravation of the arbitrariness of the past dealings; they have also their own peculiar inconveniences; the chapter is, during its period of decay, no longer to be responsible; but private irresponsible individuals, who may happen to survive, are to proceed to fill up both the stalls (as far as these remained) and the livings, which have hitherto been filled by a responsible body, the chapters; that which the chapters deprecate, the invasion of rights, and the undeserved stigma, is left; that which they asked not for, or scarcely any asked for, is flung ungraciously at them, as a "sop for Cerberus." We should be persuaded on this ground alone, that this "draft of a Report" never could have been intended by the Episcopal Commissioners to be presented, that we have not here a finished record of their opinions. It is an *apocryphal* document, artfully and surreptitiously obtained; and at the same time contrived to com-

the last with reference especially to the union of prebendal [non-residentiaries] stalls to the livings belonging to the prebends themselves, [as we understand has been seen to be advantageous elsewhere,] or to churches in populous towns within the diocese, under the patronage of the bishop, as has been done in two instances in our own cathedral, with good effect, as well as of two of the residentiaryships to archdeacons, and two to livings in the gift of the bishop."

* Gen. Mem., Canterbury, Ely, Norwich, Oxford, Rochester, Exeter, Hereford, Lichfield.

† We have noted Durham, Ely, Rochester, Lichfield; others may have escaped us, since we know that they might have alleged the same with truth.

mit, if possible, the spiritual head of the Church, to measures in which he was for some time involved, but which there was reason to believe that he had repudiated; and this belief is strengthened by the artfulness of the contrivance. He has as yet, and we trust may continue, to escape the toils laid for his feet. For this history, however, at least such parts of it as could with propriety be given, we must refer to Dr. Spry's seasonable pamphlet. We may now therefore consider ourselves in the same state as if this draft had never been prepared, for we *know*, that subsequently to the drawing up of this draft, whoever may have prepared it, the Episcopal Commissioners had, and felt, reason to draw back, and saw that the sums to be obtained from the cathedrals could not be safely trusted with a Commission, which was to be under the control of the minister for the day. Such as it is, it and the bill engrafted upon it, (which we understand is still further to despoil the chapter property,) are the production of a single political personage, not of the Commission.*

Bad then as this draft in itself is, and tricking as the contrivance and correspondence was, which drew it from the drawers of the extinct Commission, its production places the Church in a better position, by its concession of every thing which can be termed a *selfish* right, (denying only the *vested* right of continuing our succession unimpaired as we received it,) the chapters have now free scope; they have nothing to gain for themselves; and if they gain for posterity, they must lose for their selfish interests, for sacrifices must be made: they have pledged themselves to augment poorer benefices out of their funds, to submit their patronage to such useful restrictions as may be devised, at least in common with other patrons; they have professed to hold patronage, as a trust, so they must the more avoid what might seem an abuse of that trust. Thus then they may proceed to the struggle for our ancient foundations, clear and unincumbered of all imputations of selfish motives and private ends. Still more, the unseemly and painful scene of a struggle of one part of the episcopal order against the other, or of the inferior order of the clergy against a Commission, in which (though a minority) the metropolitan and some of their leading bishops were unhappily joined, is now happily removed. The Church may again be united against one, who has in many cases joined the avowed enemies of the Church, and depends upon them for support.

But, it may be asked, can nothing be done for the heathen, or worse than heathen, population of our large towns? Is part of

* Besides the late Bishop of Hereford, the Bishops of Exeter, Rochester, and Winchester have, in their charges to their clergy, spoken plainly against the recommendation of the Commission; the Bishop of Durham against part of it.

the Church to remain in comparative or real affluence, and part in its destitute condition? By no means! Only be it done honestly, lest a curse be carried thither instead of a blessing; yea, lest our whole land be cursed! Robbery is no acceptable oblation to God. Spoliation of the Church is not the way to encourage others to bestow their treasures on the Church. This, then, must be laid down as a first principle, that there is no right to disturb the pious gifts of our forefathers, because *we* think we could employ them better. If we see holy ends whereon to employ them, give we of our own, not of theirs. We dare not then bring the several plans into comparison, on the score of *expediency*; one is righteous, the other is unrighteous; but then also (as generally happens) the unrighteous plan is unwise, and the righteous plan wise; and that, not only taking into account the distant results, but the present.

There is, then, a righteous plan for removing many of our difficulties, a plan long ago recommended, and not long ago revived by one, now a Commissioner, and the adoption of which was, about three years and a half before the date of this Commission, much facilitated by a bill framed by another Commissioner,—the strictly legal use of the ecclesiastical impropriations.

The following account is chiefly taken from Kennett's interesting "*History of Impropriations*," which is largely extracted by Burn, art. Appropriation, and much of it admirably condensed in the pamphlet by the Earl of Harrowby.

The inadequate income of the parochial clergy is owing, as is generally known, in great measure, to impropriations; and to these, therefore, it is natural to look in the first instance, for their relief. The oldest system of Church property was, that it was paid into the hands of the bishop, who had the whole care of the diocese, and whose deputies the priests were; gradually portions were detached; and then came in the custom of "*appropriating the tithes*," to different religious bodies who undertook the spiritual care of those parishes. This was in itself no evil, although often abused; the laity trusted to these, as being at the time holy bodies, to provide them with ministers better than they could find for themselves; and the very extensive continuance of the practice shows that it was found beneficial; the current of charity will not set in one way without a reason. Those foundations became the richest, which had most reputation of holiness. The appropriations and patronage went virtually together; in most of these cases they were given to monasteries, in others to collegiate bodies. There existed also a check against avaricious encroachment; the vicarages were at first well endowed, and afterwards the bishop had the power to augment them,—

“ This power being expressly reserved in the instrument of appropriation, or, if not, always thought an antecedent right of the bishop, from the original constitution of the Church, continued down and confirmed by the decrees of general and provincial councils. And even the common law of the land (which in ecclesiastical matters was founded on equity and the custom of the Church), did allow and enforce this practice; the Year-books affirming that the ordinary may increase or diminish the vicar's portion. And for aught we find upon record, though this episcopal right was too often evaded by resort to the sanctuary of the monks at Rome; yet it was never questioned in any of our ecclesiastical or civil courts, before the Reformation.”

The bishop could even, on great occasions, disappropriate or restore all the profits to the vicar.

After the Reformation, the impropriations were of three classes; those which the crown retained in its own hands; those which it granted to laymen; and those which it restored to the Church, in that it made over to certain cathedrals or collegiate churches, the whole property of some of the dissolved monasteries, re-founding the ancient foundation, under the form of a cathedral or a collegiate church. From this time not only were the *lay* impropriations lost to the Church, but even the duty of providing out of them for the maintenance of a minister, to which this property had always been subject, was neglected; it was not to be expected, that they who had gained the goods of the Church by sacrilege, would care about the Church; and the Church, who had not power to prevent the spoliation, was not in a state to put in force the laws to which this sort of property, in whatever hands, was subject. They were, however, and are still, regarded as spiritual property;* even as late as Charles I., the ablest lawyers† were of opinion, that the bishop's power to order the necessary augmentations out of them still continued, and but for the Rebellion it would have been enforced.

Much more, in the case of those in the hands of ecclesiastics; for, in that they were granted back to spiritual persons, or these were made to take them from the crown in exchange for manors, it was evidently meant that they should be liable to the same responsibilities which they were before. Accordingly, ever since the Reformation, bishops and deans and chapters have from time to time augmented the vicarages out of the impropriations,‡ and

* See authorities in Kennett on Impropriations, p. 188, 9. “ Hence they are not within the statute of mortmain.” Plowd. Com. f. 499. “ Appropriate Churches are no otherwise in the hands of the laity than as spiritual livings.” Spelm. on Tithes, ib.

† Archbishop Laud's letter to Bishop Williams, ap. Kennett, Appendix, p. 43. “ Morton, Bishop of Durham, held the same, upon the authority of Lord Coventry, Mr. Noy, and Sir H. Martin.” Lord Harrowby, from Kennett, p. 145.

‡ See a number of instances, ap. Kennett.

the power of the bishop to enforce this has been recognized.* Dr. Gibson † says,

“ It seems agreed on all hands, that the ordinary hath power to oblige *spiritual* impropriators to augment vicarages, according to the case of Hitchcot and Thornburgh, 9 Car., and that the lessee (who held for lives, according to the statute of 32 Hen. VIII.) came in, subject to the same charge. It is true, this was an appropriation which had never come to the king by any statute of dissolution ; but that circumstance of having been conveyed to the king, made no difference with regard to the jurisdiction of the bishop, as long as they were reconveyed to a spiritual hand, as appears from the case of the Dean and Chapter of St. Asaph, in the 12 Jac.”

The subject of impropriations, the difficulties involved by them, and the necessity of making compensation, occur in every reign, from the time of their first dilapidation, to Queen Anne, although nothing was enforced as to the *lay portion*, except during the Usurpation, when Cromwell confiscated, for this purpose, the impropriations of the so-called delinquents. A most important measure, however, was adopted by Charles II. on his restoration (by the advice, probably, of Lord Clarendon, Archbishop Juxon, and Bishop Sheldon),‡ when he admonished, by letter, all ecclesiastical bodies or individuals holding impropriations,

“ To provide for the augmentation of such cures, that they who are immediately attending upon the performance of ministerial offices in every parish, may have a competent provision, that no lease be granted by them or their *successors*, until it be provided that the said vicarages or curates' places shall amount to 80*l.*, or more if it will bear it, in good form of law settled upon them and their successors ; that the bishop shall employ the authority, *belonging to him as ordinary*, for the augmentation of vicarages and curacies ; and that they and their successors shall report every year to the archbishop of the province, how these commands had been obeyed.”

This most seasonable injunction it was the wish of Lord Harrowby to procure to be re-enacted *prospectively* for the present times ; and in 1810 he addressed, anonymously, a printed Letter to Mr. Perceval, the then Chancellor of the Exchequer, in which he gives, in an abridged form, from Kennett and Burn, a very lucid and compact history of the several attempts to remedy the injury inflicted upon the Church at the Reformation, by the alienating of the impropriations. The remarks with which he introduces his plan, will be read with great interest.

* Kennett, pp. 49, 50 ; and Stillingfleet, *Eccl. Cases*, ib.

† Burn, p. 77, quoted by Lord Harrowby, p. 14.

‡ Lord Harrowby, p. 31.

"To those who are desirous, in every proposal respecting the Church, *insistere super antiquas vias*, it is also a strong objection, that, at the different periods when the situation of the clergy has been under the consideration of the legislature, a measure so obvious, and at first sight so plausible [as that of the raising of the tenths and first-fruits to their real value, for the benefit of the poor livings], never appears to have been seriously entertained. We must, therefore, either entirely abandon the hope of deriving any relief from the funds of the Church, or we must resort either to reasoning or to history for some better mode. *The latter will usually be found, upon such subjects, the safest instructor.* If we follow the footsteps of our ancestors, we shall in general proceed, *if not rapidly, at least securely.* Our edifice will stand the firmer, if it is erected upon ancient foundations."*

This Letter was re-printed with his name in 1831, in the prospect that "the affairs of the Church seemed likely to occupy the early attention of parliament and the public," and in the same year was passed the Archbishop of Canterbury's act (1 & 2 Will. IV. c. 45) "to extend the Provisions of the Act of 29 Car. II. for confirming and perpetuating Augmentations made by Ecclesiastical Persons to small Vicarages."

This act proposed great advantages; for it was an evil which before much withheld the liberality of such persons, that there was no security that their successors would continue what they had begun; from the mode of leasing ecclesiastical property, such augmentations, unless made prospectively, are made to great disadvantage; and yet, if made prospectively, another generation might come in, and take to themselves what these had intended for the benefit of the incumbents. The act of Will. IV. remedied this, by enabling ecclesiastical persons to endow in perpetuity any church or chapel within the parish of which they hold the impropriation, out of that *impropriation*, or to annex any portion of *land* to any church or chapel of which they had the patronage; so that the annual value should not be made to exceed 300*l.*, or, including surplice fees, 350*l.*

This valuable act commenced its operation from Oct. 15, 1831; the returns to the ecclesiastical revenues were to be made up to the end of that same year. We have consequently no official information of the extent to which ecclesiastical persons have availed themselves of it. Under the head, however of "expected increase or decrease of income," notice that they have, or intend, as occasion offers, to avail themselves of this act, is given by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York; the Bishops of Durham, Gloucester, Lichfield and Coventry, Lincoln, London, Norwich, Winchester; as also by the Chapters of Durham, Exeter, Oxford, Rochester, Westminster, and Windsor. This does not include

* Lord Harrowby, p. 11.

all who have made augmentations, since, as before noticed, Ely, in its Memorial, mentions that it had augmented its livings, yet gives no notice of it here. The act was so recent, that some chapters doubtless had not matured their plans; some did not take it into account. Two also of the best endowed colleges in the two universities, St. Mary Magdalen, Oxford, and Trinity College, Cambridge, (the latter of which is largely endowed with impropriations,) had, for some time, been augmenting their incumbencies, and to the latter the act in question would be especially acceptable.

The extent also to which this plan, at so early a stage, had been carried by different of these persons or bodies should not be overlooked: the augmentations of the late Bishop of Durham were of so much moment, that in the so-called "Established Church Bill," provision was expressly made that his uncompleted arrangements should not be affected by it; he had completed grants to the amount of 1170*l.* per annum; the Dean and Chapter of Durham state, that "their augmentations, exclusive of those granted previously to 1831, amounting to 1734*l.* 2*s.* 9*d.*, are estimated at 3000*l.* per annum;"* those of the Archbishop of Canterbury already granted are 1040*l.* per annum; the income of the Bishop of Lincoln, it is said, will be "*considerably* diminished;" "the annual income of Winchester is reduced 400*l.* per annum; and it is intended to augment all the small livings in the gift of the see to 200*l.* per annum;" the same amount has been fixed as the minimum by the Chapters of Westminster and Rochester (although, in the latter case, the livings so circumstanced are few); "the expenditure of Windsor will be much increased by the augmentations lately made to small livings;" the grants of Christ Church, Oxford, under this act, including two before let as beneficial leases to the vicar, independently of its annual grants, amount to about 2000*l.* per annum.†

These, it is to be recollected, are specimens only, and at the beginning of things; chapters are not, at present, even *permitted* to raise their vicarages, by way of endowment, to the highest scale contemplated by the Commissioners; much more would doubtless be ultimately done, if permitted; the practice of libe-

* Eccl. Revenues' P port, p. 14.

† We may here add one or two facts as to cathedrals which we happen to know; the chapter of Durham began its augmentations at the Restoration, and has, ever since, granted large sums for the building of churches and endowments: in Christ Church, Oxford, 16,000*l.* has, during the last hundred years, been expended in the augmentation of small livings from monies left by two canons, Dr. South and Stratford; and, during the last thirty-six, the dean and chapter have of their own contributed 14,000*l.* more. They are now in the habit of applying about 1000*l.* per annum to the augmentation of the incomes of the incumbents, or the erection of parsonage-houses.

ality, through the blessing of God, strengthens it; the eye opens wider to its duties and responsibilities, and takes in a wider range; objects are seen, after a time, to fall within it, which were not perceived, until its faculties were practised and its attention fixed. Then, also, persons gradually fall in with any diminution of income resulting from it; a sacrifice, when made, is found never to cost so much as in prospect was expected. We wish only for time for the deans and chapters, and we doubt not such kindness or justice would be shown to their incumbents, as might become an example and a stimulant to others also.

There are also several advantages attending this augmentation by the bodies themselves. We need not mention the greater security of the property, and the absence of the expense of a board, &c., which would make a considerable deduction in the case of a general fund, nor the justice of considering primarily and without any comparison with other places, those from which the tithes are derived, or which are connected with these foundations; we will advert for the time to two points of calculation only, which may verify that the most righteous plan is the most beneficial, and attest even in this way the sound policy of honesty.

These are, 1st, the extent of benefit, 2d, speed in completing it; so that we shall have not only "*bis dat qui cito dat*," but "*bis dat*" and "*cito dat*" too, literally, twice as much, and twice as soon.

The advantage in point of "extent" results from the mode of letting of this property. It is let on what was formerly among the laity also the (or at least *a* very) ordinary mode of leasing lands in England, on terms of twenty-one years, renewable every seven, or on three lives, renewable whenever one drops. In this tenure, it is a reversionary income which is sold, whenever the lease is filled up, the immediate property belonging already to the lessee; it is the value of seven years after the fourteen still remaining in the lease, or of a life in addition to two lives by which the lease is still held. This tenure is, of course, disadvantageous to the lessor, in that the money is received so long beforehand; and it has, consequently, been for the most part abandoned by the laity, although some instances still remain, at least, in the West of England; the clergy have retained it, partly because it is more suited to their profession, in that it avoids much of the business attending the management of property leased at rack-rent, partly because being life-holders themselves, their own incomes might be seriously affected by any great or sudden change, partly out of regard to their lessees, who, in some cases, have held of them ever since or before the Reformation. These leases are also beneficial leases, in order that the lessee may have an interest in the property, and be their almoner to the poor. The

ordinary ratio, then, we believe, of the sum received to the ultimate value of the property is as one and a half to seven;* in common language, a fine of about one year and a half is taken for adding seven years to the lease. In the case of lives, the sum received is in proportion less. In proportion, then to the disadvantages of this tenure, are the facilities of augmenting vicarages by the act 1 & 2 Will. IV. c. 45. For this enables ecclesiastical persons to attach, *in reversion*, to the vicarages or curacies the property thus forestalled, so that, by diminishing their own present income, they can add, at the expiration of the lease, what shall bear the proportion of seven to one and a half. Thus, by foregoing fines to the amount of 3000*l.* a-year, they deduct from their income, on the whole seven years, 4500*l.*; i. e. for 4500*l.* every seven years, or, dispersed over the seven years, about 650*l.* per annum, they can, after fourteen years, add to their vicarages 3000*l.* per annum, or in the course of the seven years 21,000*l.* At this rate, the 120,000 a-year, which the Commissioners think to obtain from their immense confiscation of offices and property, *might* be obtained, *without the sacrifice of a single stall*, at the expense of 25,714*l.* per annum, diffused over the whole body of ecclesiastical impropiators, archbishops, bishops, deans and chapters, corporations sole, non-residentiaries, colleges.

It may be objected to this that the lessees would be injured. In what we have said, we have put only a hypothetical case, for, if the stalls were preserved, there would not be the same occasion for raising the 120,000*l.* per annum. But this is certain both in equity and law, that the lessees received their leases under certain conditions; and, of these, a primary duty is the adequate provision for the benefices whence the tithes accrue; the holders of impropriations could grant leases on no other terms, for they themselves received them on this condition. But, besides this, *as a fact*, the great proportion of holders of Ecclesiastical leases are the landed aristocracy; men, as a body, far too high-minded and high-principled to consider their own diminution of interest in the property, when the object of that diminution is the better provision for the spiritual wants of the people; and that, in the very parishes where their own property is situate. On the contrary, we well *know*, that the lessees receive these propositions gladly, that holding the rest of their estate leased to them on the same terms as before, they are *glad* to relinquish a portion for the improvement of the respective cures.

* The deduction from the See of Canterbury for reversionary augmentations to the amount of 1040*l.* is given (Report I. p. 5) at 232*l.*, which is in this ratio. It may vary perhaps from one year and a half to two years in practice, though the lessors are under no obligation to adhere to any rule, nor is it made known.

2. With regard to *time*, the Commissioners thought it necessary, even in the Second Report, to guard against any expectations of speedy benefit from this plan.

"Whatever resources may be obtained, by carrying into effect the measures which we are prepared to recommend, it should be borne in mind, that, as the operation of those measures must of necessity be gradual, so also must be the additions which will result from them to our existing means. We are therefore desirous of not appearing to encourage any expectation of a large immediate accession to the funds, which are now available to the augmentation of poor benefices, and the creation of new ones. It is, however, to be hoped, that the sacrifices, which will be required from the cathedral and collegiate churches of the country, will have the effect of stimulating individual benevolence, to contribute towards the accomplishment of these most important ends."

And, since this warning, the period when any benefit could be reaped is still further delayed by the provisions which they thought themselves bound in equity to make in the Fourth Report, whereby some of the stalls are to be again filled up before their final suppression.

"Why," asks Dr. Spry,* "should a financial measure be recommended when immediate funds are required, which the plainest principles of justice make it necessary to clog with provisions rendering it utterly incapable of furnishing them? Or, what are the merits of a plan, which can afford no real assistance to the present generation, and will only mock the future by raising expectations that never can be effectually realized?"

The only *immediate* prospect held out in the Report, is from the "stimulating of individual benevolence;" a remarkable and well calculated way, doubtless, of "stimulating individual benevolence," by setting before their eyes that trusts are no longer held sacred, and that the endowments they bestow will be alienated from the objects whereon they bestow them, so soon as the penury of posterity, treading in our steps, should think it expedient to divert them. However, the Commissioners look forward to a distant day, whereas the present possessors of cathedral property have professed their willingness to concur in any plan for improving the vicarages of which they hold the impropriations; they have in part begun to do it; they received the property under condition of so doing, and their obligation is recognised by ecclesiastical law. What they so do, would not only be done with great advantage, but would commence at the expiration of their present leases.

With regard to the extent of the benefit thus to be derived, it

* Observations, p. 30.

appears that there are towards 4692 impropriations in England and Wales, 38 of which are held by the crown, 1806 by ecclesiastical foundations, bishops, deans and chapters, non-residentiaries, minor canons, universities, colleges, and hospitals, 2552 by private owners, 43 by municipal corporations, 132 have been wholly restored to the vicarages, and 121 in part. Of these, the principles of Lord Harrowby's plan would immediately apply to the 1806 held by ecclesiastical foundations,* towards 3-7ths of the whole: and when the church-foundations were thus setting in earnest about the benefiting the parishes, whereof they held the impropriations, we cannot doubt that the crown would, if the case were set earnestly before it, free itself of the responsibility of holding spiritual property, i. e. holding back from God what is His. The Archbishop of Canterbury once addressed a queen,† warning her that

“ those kings, her predecessors, and many private Christians, have also given to God, and to this Church, much land, and many immunities, which they might have given to those of their families, and did not, but gave them for ever as an absolute right and sacrifice to God: and, with these immunities and lands they have entailed a curse upon the alienators of them; God prevent your majesty and your successors from being liable to that curse, which will cleave unto church-lands, as the leprosy to the Jews.”

He reminded her, also, of

“ what is already become visible in many families, ‘ that church-land, added to an ancient and just inheritance, has proved like a moth fretting a garment, and secretly consumed both;’ or, ‘ like the eagle that stole a coal from the altar, and thereby set her nest on fire, which consumed both her young eagles and herself that stole it.’ ”

He reminded her, also, respectfully, that

“ a part of the Church's rights, added to the vast treasure left to her father by his father, hath been conceived to bring an unavoidable consumption upon both, notwithstanding all his diligence to preserve them.”

Since that time her father's house has become extinct; the houses of Stuart, Orange, Denmark, have passed away; we cannot doubt that it would be for the stability of the present throne,

* Lord Harrowby himself excepted colleges, for fear that any great reduction might diminish too much the means of the education of the clergy: the colleges, however, received their impropriations on these express conditions; and, as they received them by gift with this condition, not by purchase, the plea set up for the laymen does not apply to them. They are altogether in the same situation as when they received them, and bound to discharge the trust. Lord Harrowby recognises them as ecclesiastical bodies; and it is only, as such, that they have any right to tithes, or the University of Durham could have been founded by the late bishop.

† † Archbishop Whitgift's noble and eloquent speech to Queen Elizabeth is printed in Kennett, App. p. 18.

were such remains of Church property, as are yet in its hands, restored. The sacrifice is not much ; the principle of having clean hands, everything ; it has been acted upon, in great measure, in the Channel Islands,* and we doubt not that it has been through want of attention, that it has not been completed in England.†

But neither would it stop here ; we make no *claim* upon laymen,—though we ourselves should not feel at ease, had we, as individuals, any Church property in our hands ; but we make no claim ; the property has, for the most part, “ eaten through ” and “ eaten up ” the families, which first unadvisedly added it to their store ; they have perished : the present have, in most cases, obtained it by ordinary purchase, not by the sacrilege of their ancestors. There are, however, other cases,—cases of noble families, who have been allowed to retain it ; and we doubt not, that on any general plan of benefiting the parochial cures, they, though not compelled by human law, will, in many cases, feel themselves impelled by the Divine ; that they will, out of piety towards God, for the good of the Church, and of *their own families*, give back all, or a part of that which has hitherto brought no blessing to their families, hoping to receive it back in blessing from God. Our forefathers did so ; though small in proportion to the whole, “ 132 impropriations have been wholly restored, 121 in part ; ” 253 several persons, at least, must have been stirred up to this act of restitution. Why should we think our times so incapable of making the like sacrifice ? “ Zacchæus restored four-fold,” why should we deem our Christian nobility, sensible as many of them are to feelings of high honour and Christian duty, insensible to the honourable act of restoring that which came to their forefathers unlawfully, (through robbery as well as sacrilege), or to the Christian duty of giving unto God what is His ? Why should we think our Protestant nobility incapable of doing that which the despised monks did ? We are sure that we should have some instances, at least. We believe that the subject has never been brought forward without some restitution taking place ; we look to the 253 restitutions, and take courage ;

* The Ecclesiastical Revenue Report states, (App. p. 47), that “ in Jersey and Guernsey the benefices are merely nominal rectories, the incumbent not being entitled, in any case, to more than a portion (generally one-third) of the great tithes, the crown or governor taking the residue ; and, in some cases, the whole goes to the crown or governor.” Since that time, in Guernsey, the crown has given back all but about 100*l.* per annum.

† In the parish of Halifax, of which the crown holds the great tithes (whether it collects them or no, we know not), the population in 1831 was 109,899. Church room, 15,730, one-seventh, leaving 62,700 unprovided for ; Clergy 18, with incomes (except the vicarage, which is £1678) two of £55 and £76, thirteen under £200, one £250.

we look back to the 253 blessed souls,* whose "works have followed them," who are now enjoying a portion of the reward, for their sacrifice here; and we cannot think that others will not be joined to them.

Then, farther, whatever be the case of individuals, there is a great debt owed by the nation to God. The Parliament gave to Henry VIII. the power of appropriating, under various pretences, the property of the monasteries, not simply what was given them, as such, but the ancient property of the Church, which was in their keeping; they gave the power to King Henry, hoping to receive back the equivalent, and to be individually sharers in the spoil. The Parliaments extorted from Queen Mary the confirmation of these confiscations;† and, to quote authority, which this age listens to with contentment, and praises his philosophy, Lord Chancellor Bacon:‡

"In my own opinion and sense, I must confess (let me speak it with reverence), that all the Parliaments since 27 and 31 of Hen. VIII. (who gave away impropriations from the Church), seem to me to stand in a sort obnoxious, and obliged to God in conscience, to do somewhat for the Church; to reduce the patrimony thereof to a competency: for since they have debarred Christ's wife of a great part of her dowry, it were reason they made her a competent jointure."

Or is it to be supposed that this age, which idolizes the Baconian philosophy, idolizes also the one blot which stains the memory of its founder, and likes at once his theory and practice, to speculate and to receive bribes?

The Parliament has voted 20,000,000*l.* on the notion of restitution to the slave-holders in the West Indies; why should we think that it would refuse restitution to God? While asked, it devised plans, though they were not realized; let it be asked, not as a favour but as a debt; not as a gift, but as a restitution; not to make a boast of, but to avert the wrath of God, whose Church has been suffering these 300 years, for the spoliation inflicted by a former Parliament, lest He allow the flames, which are at present smothered, but which show themselves visibly here and there, to burst out, and "consume us and our house." Like the eagle, we have "placed our nest in the rocks," but our "latter end" may be, "that we perish for ever." We have placed our nest in the rocks, but, with the flesh of the sacrifice, we have brought

* The memory of several of these pious persons has been embalmed by Bishop Kennett, in his *Cases of Impropriations*: the restitution of some was occasioned by Sir H. Spelman's impressive "*History of Sacrilege*."

† As the price of "repealing all statutes, articles, and provisions made against the see apostolic of Rome, since the 20th year of king Henry VIII."—Kennett, p. 141.

‡ Considerations touching the Edification and Purification of the Church of England.—*ib.* p. 189.

thither the coal which shall consume it; and unless God "send a gracious rain" to extinguish the commencing flames,

"The blackness of ashes shall mark where it stood,
And the wild mother's scream o'er her famishing brood."

Be the demand made in earnest, and boldly, "in the Name of God;" let the people be taught whence this lack of instruction comes, not from the overgrown incomes of bishops, or from deans and chapters, but from the spendthrift sacrilege of the nation of old, which wasted the inheritance of God, and "consumed it on their lusts," and, we doubt not, that the call will, sooner or later, be answered.

Such are the ulterior prospects, which the acting upon Lord Harrowby's plan opens: how soon those prospects are realized, will depend upon our own earnestness in realizing to ourselves what national sins,* and the sin of sacrilege, are. We boast of our study of Holy Scriptures, let us read it there; of our Reformers, let men read the martyr Latimer.

With regard, however, to the immediate results, we will compare in some instances the result of Lord Harrowby's plan with that proposed by the Commissioners; augmentation out of the ecclesiastical impropriations with augmentations out of the dean and chapter corporate revenues. And in so doing, we shall show, in some measure, to what extent this relief will go. According to the Commissioners' scale and Report there are in the diocese of Ely, 47 benefices requiring an increase on the whole of 4020*l.* per annum; (our estimate was something different, as they have not clearly expressed the data on which they proceeded, yet sufficiently near, 3867*l.*); of this they proposed to augment, *in the first place*, what was in public *patronage*, 2819*l.* per annum: Lord Harrowby, where ecclesiastics are impropriators; this would amount to 2465*l.* per annum: viz. in colleges, 878*l.*, chapters, 1107*l.*,† bishop, 480*l.*, leaving 964*l.* to lay impropriations, and but 438*l.* where there are no impropriations at all. Now the reservation of 2465*l.* annual income, on the expiration of the present leases, mostly at the term of 14—21 years, would cost annually but 528*l.* 4*s.* 4*d.*; in the case of lives, the cost would be less, the benefit more remote. Thus then nearly the whole benefit, which the Commissioners contemplate, might be obtained at a sacrifice of 528*l.* 4*s.* 4*d.*, which, spread over these several

* "When questions are raised about continuing the service for King Charles the Martyr, I answer, by pointing to the case of 'the sinners, the Amalekites,' who were judged at the distance of 500 years,"—*Froude's Remains*, vol. i. p. 432.

† Barnwell, or St. Andrew the Less, a donative containing 6909, with an income of 48*l.*, has been accounted as a part of St. Andrew the Greater, of which the dean and chapter of Ely are impropriators.

sources, would not be hurtfully felt ; nearly the whole sum which they calculated upon from the confiscation of four stalls, and the separate estates of Ely, 2824*l.*, might be obtained, and the stalls might remain for such diocesan purposes as might be required. But then we are justified in expecting that this would not be all the benefit ; among the lay impropriations there is one which, on the Commissioners' scale, would receive 80*l.*, held now in plurality, of which a noble duke, whose ancestry shared largely in Church-property, is impropriator and patron : another, with a population of 4000, would receive 78*l.* ; another, above 2000, 238*l.*, in both of which the same earl is impropriator ; a fourth, with a population of 588, receives but 88*l.*, another earl being the impropriator. We feel convinced that these, and many others, would not be allowed so to continue, if the thoughts of the lay impropriators were earnestly called to their responsibility, and the example set by the ecclesiastics.

To take a more extensive case, the largest of all, the diocese of York. This, according to the Commissioners, would require 45,356*l.*, of which 23,891*l.* is in public patronage. Our calculations have fallen somewhat short of this, 44,163*l.* Yet this will suffice to show the proportions. Of this sum then, 16,856*l.* would be bestowed upon livings, in which the impropriations belong to that class, which the Commissioners call "public : " viz. the Crown, 3209*l.* ; the archbishop of York, 2549*l.* ; other bishops, 250*l.* ; chapters, 5950*l.* ; colleges, 2454*l.* ; hospitals and schools, 2444*l.* This, according to the above ratio, would, on Lord Harrowby's plan, or the Archbishop's Act, require a deduction from their joint revenues of 3612*l.* per annum ; *i.e.* 3612*l.* per annum in the one way, would go as far as 16,856*l.* in the other, or would procure it. Further, of the sums thus required for the remaining livings, 4675*l.* per annum is for livings of which peers, and, in many cases, very wealthy and well-disposed peers, are the impropriators ; 14,844*l.* is, where other laymen are impropriators ; and 7772*l.* only, where we have not ascertained that there is any impropriation ; *i.e.* little more than one-sixth of the whole sum is wanting on account of the real poverty of the Church, and, of the remaining deficiency, 22,729*l.* is owing to spoliation, the tithes being in the hands of the crown or of laymen.

To take the other most crying case, the diocese of Chester. For it, 41,854*l.* would be required according to the principles of the Report ; 25,868*l.* for livings in private patronage ; 15,986*l.* for those to be first augmented, those in public patronage. The application of *impropriations* belonging to the same class would yield nearly the same sum, 12,312*l.* ; the crown, 2976*l.*, bishops,

2518*l.*, colleges, 2850*l.*, chapters,* 3968*l.*; whereof the Church portion, 9356*l.* per annum, might, as above, be obtained by a sacrifice of 2005*l.* per annum. The remainder, as far as we have ascertained it, consists of 3,853*l.* impropriations of peers; 8993*l.* other lay people, and 12,591*l.* not accounted for. This is not given as adequate information; it is felt to be inadequate; it would be to do what has been imputed as an error to the Commissioners, to rely solely or mainly upon the Ecclesiastical Revenue Returns. The number of perpetual curacies very much increases the difficulty; in that they have been taken out of some rectory, but without local knowledge it would often not appear to what they belonged.

The two cases of York and Chester have been purposely selected, as being the most unfavourable; it is the uniform answer of such as advocate the fusing of church property into one common fund, "what is otherwise to be done for the great towns of Cheshire, Lancashire, or Yorkshire?" and it appears thus far, that upon Lord Harrowby's plan nearly as much might be done, without destroying a single stall (and leaving, therefore, a proportion of stalls to be employed in judicious annexation),† as by that sketched by the Commissioners. But neither have we thus at all exhausted the resources of the act 1 & 2 Will. IV. c. 45, for this extends not only to cases of impropriations, but where ecclesiastics, having property of any sort, have the patronage also. This, then, bishops have acted upon, and upon true church principles; we deprecate exceedingly any interference with their incomes; their property has been confided to them, to deal with it according to their judgment, and no earthly power has any right to step in and control it; they are the stewards of God. Still, however circumstances have since changed, they were originally the treasurers of the Church's property, to apportion it as they pleased; the liberality of our early forefathers gave them an ample income, while yet the inferior clergy of their dioceses "had no lack." The sacrilege committed at the Reformation has sadly changed the condition of these latter; and therefore, if any of

* Manchester has here been omitted, as being a case per se; the Collegiate Church is impropiator, and so responsible as far as its means will go.

† We have not entered upon the subject of annexation, because Lord John Russell (see above) proposes to annex almost all the remaining stalls (thus making the stall a parochial commendam); yet a great deal of good might be legitimately done, not by subdividing canonries but by requiring them to keep an efficient body of curates. Thus Leeds had a population of 123,393, Church-room for 12,243, one-tenth, unprovided for 86,654. Income (including vicarage £1257) £4010 among 14 clergy and the assistant curates of the vicar. For this the (unproductive) impropriation belonging to Christ Church, Oxford, would not suffice; but annexation might be resorted to. So also most of the Cathedral towns have large ill-endowed cures, as Ely, Exeter, Rochester (Chatham, 18,000, church-room for 3,600) &c.

them have (as the Commission assumes) more than they need, it were in entire conformity with the practice of the Church for them to part with some of their funds, and send out fresh clergy into such parts of their dioceses as are not provided for. We deprecate, again, expressing any opinion as to the incomes of the Archbishops, or of the Bishops of London and Durham ; but this we say, that if it pleases these most reverend fathers to part with any portion of their income, in order to send forth fresh shepherds to seek after their Master's scattered sheep, it is a godly and acceptable act to the Great Shepherd, of whose sheep they have the charge; but it is contrary to every principle of church polity, that their property should be taken from their see by any human power; it is contrary to the first principles of justice, that it should be taken, while the vineyard of their own diocese lies waste, because they are to be deprived of that wherewith to hire labourers to dress it and to keep it.

Thus, to give instances, the sum needed, according to the Commissioners' scale, for livings of which the see of York is impropriator, is 2374*l.* per annum; on the scale of their real wants it would be far higher; one of these places, of which the see is impropriator and patron, is the important town of Doncaster, its population at the last census was 11,572, its vicar has 125*l.* per annum; a perpetual curacy (founded, it seems, by private bounty,) yields the only assistance; and 11,572 persons were committed, at most, to two clergy, when on an efficient system there ought to have been eleven. The *mere* raising such an endowment to 400*l.* per annum, as the Commissioners propose, would do little or no good; we need not only larger stipends, but an enlarged body of clergy; the *mere* raising of stipends might diminish the discomforts of the clergy, but would leave the large masses of our population as heathen as before. To take a case of the other sort, the archbishop is patron of Silkstone vicarage, and the Barnsleys, in Silkstone, perpetual curacies (the rectory appears to be lost); according to the Report, the aggregate population was 14,682; having churches containing 3170, and four clergymen, with an average of 155*l.* per annum. The Commissioners' scale would allot them 580*l.* in addition; but what are four clergy, or church-room for 3170, among 14,682 souls? We instance this, not as one of the heavier cases, but as one which would naturally look to the archbishop for relief (if relief, according to the plan of the Commission, is to be given), and which would be injured by the abstraction of any property of the see, to eke out the loss of "commendams *without* cure of souls." Alas! it would be easy to multiply cases in which the diocese would have a prior claim upon the episcopal bounty, over any distinct see; but it is not for us

to seem to parcel out the property of the see; what has been said is enough to illustrate the injustice of taking away any portion of it for other dioceses.

Again, to instance the other archiepiscopal see: if certain perpetual curacies are excluded, the sum to be added (on the Commissioners' scale) to the *livings* of which the see is impropriator (we believe 1203*l.* per annum), very little exceeds that which the present archbishop has already annexed in reversion, 1090*l.*; but this is the very least portion of what is required for the efficient cure even of those places. It is what are called valuable livings which are often in most need. Thus, in the diocese of Chester, his grace is the patron and impropriator of two important and well-endowed livings, Rochdale 1730*l.*, and Blackburn 893*l.*; yet these two livings, with the perpetual curacies belonging to them, and in the nomination of the vicar, contained, at the last census, Rochdale 76,174, Blackburn 58,231 souls. These, in Blackburn, are (exclusive of the mother Church, which contains 2200) distributed, as far as they can be said to be distributed, among the chapelries or perpetual curacies, with church-room for 12,375 (one-fourth), and stipends, rising from 34*l.*, 43*l.*, 67*l.*, to 156*l.*, in all 1431*l.* In Rochdale, the chief parish comprises 34,277, its churches at most 2093; the whole district has, besides the mother Church, eight churches or chapels, with stipends rising from 67*l.* to 256*l.*, in all 1147*l.* The entire proportion, or rather disproportion, of church-room, is one-tenth; so that if we take the average of one-third as the standard, there are 53,818 persons destitute of the means of grace. To add a third case in the same diocese: the see of Canterbury is the patron of Whalley, and most of the perpetual curacies in the district belonging to it, are in the nomination of the vicar; the see is stated to be the impropriator of one district; a nobleman, of Whalley itself. Of course the see can be no further responsible, in this case, than for its own impropriation; yet, when arrangements are being made for parting with the revenues of the see, certainly the perpetual curacies of Whalley, which were confided to its cure, are more natural objects of her fostering care than the episcopal fund. The whole district of Whalley contained 85,768 souls; that portion more immediately under the see, as belonging to, or being in the nomination of its vicar, 55,729, in ten districts, with church-room for one-sixth, 9009; accordingly 28,700 are left to Heathenism.

No one can imagine that any of this is said in blame either of the present or former metropolitans; impropriations often become, from change of circumstances, of little value; nor can strangers know any thing of the circumstances; his grace has

conferred a good deed upon the Church, for which she will have reason to value his memory, in resuming what our ancient bishops strove to do, but which, since the Revolution, till now, had been neglected, the improvement of poor vicarages by means of impropriations. The above instances have only been given to illustrate the superiority of the plan of Sir Robert Peel's over this later commission, and that it is best for each foundation to take care of its own, not to confound all in a common fund. These are the strongest cases with regard to the archiepiscopal property; they are the wants of nearly 200,000 souls; and it is impossible to doubt, that far more good would be done by the single example of these 200,000 being adequately provided for by him, whom the very law terms their patron, a greater stimulus be given to other Christian exertion, than by any purpose to which the fund could apply it. To name one more case: these numbers give an inadequate notion to persons unfamiliar with the place where they are collected: Ramsgate is close at hand; yet few ever have seen its single church, presiding, nobly as it does, over the town, and not have felt that one large church, chiefly occupied by the rich, with a chapel, was utterly inadequate for that population, which spreads on all sides beneath it; no one could think that three clergymen were sufficient for it; it also is an impropriation of the see of Canterbury; its income just reaches the highest level of the Commission, 400*l.*, and from it would have no aid. Blackburn is more than eight, Whalley more than ten, Rochdale about seven Ramsgates.

It is not necessary to illustrate the cases of other dioceses with the same detail; it may suffice briefly to state, that of the contributing bishoprics, Ely (whose average income is now rated at 8000*l.* instead of 1100*l.*) derives a part of its income from vicarages, which, on the Commissioners' scale, would require an increase of 1255*l.* per annum, and this is obviously the minimum not the maximum, and of these, three might well employ two clergymen; yet it were idle to suppose that when the wants of Cheshire and Lancashire are prominent in men's minds, as *the* object to be attended to, they will pay due regard to populations of 300 or 400. Again, a parish of 130 or 155 (such are some of those of which the bishop holds the impropriations) would have a claim which would be felt by a bishop in dispensing *his* income; but they would obviously be lost in a board accustomed to the contemplation of thousands. Yet, though comparatively of less apparent account, they are obviously to be considered *absolutely*, in the first instance, without any reference to any others, *because* it is their property. But this is not in human nature; their claims would come to be looked at suspiciously as preventing a greater good; they would

be pared down, if regarded at all; or two or more thrown into one, or got rid of somehow. No one can think that when the fund, if ever obtained, came to be applied, the Commissioners would ever examine the impropriations of the see of Ely, which might have been augmented, had not the 2500*l.* per annum been abstracted from it. The utmost that they would do, would be to look at the places whence the confiscated fund is to arise; and even this grudgingly, as interfering with a greater object. Injustice then will be done in this way to Ely.

This need not be repeated again and again; if the bishops think their incomes larger than they need, their dioceses are the natural recipients of their bounty, and there, unhappily, is not a diocese in England which might not most thankfully receive any overflowings of their goodness. The bishops can, at present, benefit to most advantage the spots where their impropriations or their estates lie, but if these will not exhaust their store, it were better far that they should have a fresh enabling act, whereby they might pour back into some other portion of their diocese, whatever it pleases them to bestow, than to transfer it to a general extra-diocesan fund.

Further, although the dioceses should receive back out of the common fund the same bounty which they would from their bishop, the plan of a common fund would evidently be objectionable, not only as wasteful and insecure, and at best circuitous, but because, first, it would do it at disadvantage, in the ratio of seven to one and a half; secondly, the bishop, not a fund, is the natural benefactor of his clergy. The gift of the bishop is affectionate and attaching; that of the fund, dispensing the resources of others, mere matter of pounds, shillings and pence.

There is one more diocese, however, which is the more worth considering, because upon it turns the whole plan. If Durham retain any large portion of its property, the general fund is at an end; for the chapter of Durham alone is to yield one-fourth of the whole chapter, the bishopric one-third of the episcopal, fund. We are here mainly concerned with the latter, but both turn upon the same principle; and there lies an *à priori* suspicion of bias (which one of the lay Commissioners honestly admitted)* in their decision as to the claims of the diocese to be considered apart.

* "Surely this House ought in justice to introduce such a clause or instruction to the Committee as will save some portion of this 40,000*l.*, which, it seems, is to be taken away without any explanation whatever, except, indeed, it be that the whole amount is grasped because it is the easiest to lay hold of, as a noble earl, one of the Commissioners, said to me, 'Oh! Durham is the great nest-egg: if we do not pounce upon that, we can do nothing at all.' My lords, I do protest against this wholesale dealing."—(Marquis of Londonderry on Durham Eccl. Revenues, July 21, 1836, *Mirr. of Parl.* 2473.)

To take then two places only, in which the bishop has property, and therefore, as frequently explained, could aid them to great advantage, Gateshead and Sunderland, neither have any other resource.

So long then as Gateshead and Sunderland remain as orphan children cast upon his care and tutelage, with no adequate provision,* with a population of about 30,000, and church-room for one-tenth, and destitution for seven-tenths, even above 20,000 souls, we think it, we must speak, a sinful thing to take away the children's bread, and to give to others. Again, if the bishop of Durham ought to help his poorer brethren among the bishops, he might aid them, and the children of the see at the same time, by relieving his brother of Carlisle, (who, with the dean and chapter, is the impropriator of Newcastle,) of the responsibility attending its destitution. Newcastle, with a population of about 60,000, has church-room again for about one-tenth, only that the destitute, seven-tenths, are in this case twice as many, above 40,000.† We cannot but think, if something of this kind was attempted, a similar spirit might be kindled in noble dukes, who are well able, and, we trust, willing to spare a portion at least of what once was given to the Church; and that Alnwick, Earsden, and Tynemouth, (portions of whose inappropriate tithes are held by one duke,) would not, with populations severally of 6788, 6757, and 26,707, be left with church-room for 1150, 200,‡ and 2000, and their ministers with incomes of 175*l.*, 119*l.*, 298*l.*, i. e., that one-twelfth only of the whole number should have a place wherein to worship God, 30,000 be left destitute. Nor are these by any means all the cases of *great* emergency; there would still remain,

	Pop.	Room.	Income.	Clergy.	Imp.
Monk-Wearmouth	9428	1000	225	1	lay.
Chester-le-Street§	10,493	1000	377	3	lay.
Darlington . . .	9419	1200	274	2	another duke.

again, by a sort of miserable uniformity, one-tenth provided for, and 20,000 deprived of their birth-right. We have no reason

* Gateshead and Sunderland are both rectories; Gateshead with 636*l.* per annum, (distinct from Gateshead-fell, population 3339, church 1000, income 172*l.*,) Sunderland altogether 386*l.*, whereas they require thirty clergy.

† Since the above was in type, we see in the statistic account, quoted p. 551, in Newcastle, "a new Church built, but not endowed."

‡ So in the Ecclesiastical Revenues Report; one should have wished to hope it was a misprint for 2000, which would have been near the right proportion.

§ Exclusive of Tanfield, population 2500, church-room 700, income 133*l.*, impropriator and patron a peer.

to think that the present noble possessors of a portion of these tithes, even know that they possess them, or the moral misery caused by their holding or withholding them; but should they be unwilling to help in the good work (which we have no knowledge of, either way) we had rather see the Church take it wholly upon herself, and re-place from what remains what was taken from her, than leave such cases of destitution.

In addition to these, in one only of which there is any ecclesiastical impropriation, are the following places with large populations, of which the dean and chapter of Durham are impropriators.

	Population.	Church.	Income.	Clergy.
Berwick	8920	1000	£353	1
South Shields in Jarrow	11407	2000	330	1
Tweedmouth	4971	200	144	1
Westoe in Jarrow	9680	1300	222	1
Jarrow with	3598	355	197	2
Heworth	5424	1100		
	<hr/> 44,000	<hr/> 5955	<hr/> 1246	<hr/> 6

The poverty of income we know that the dean and chapter have amended, as far as is allowed them, although by the terms of the act 1 & 2 Will. IV. we see not how in these cases it could exceed 507*l.* per annum; we know also that they contemplated to build and endow a second church at Berwick;* but the lack of church-room and of ministers could not be so readily supplied; again, we have but between one-seventh and one-eighth provided for, and 28,135 destitute; we have (so at least the returns give) six clergy to minister among 44,000,—six, where there ought to be forty-four.

There are other cases requiring help, although less strong than these, as—

	Population.	Church.	Income.
Falstone R.	4561	600	£219
Stockton-upon-Tees† .	7991	1500	247 lay imp.
Newburn	4639	600	230 Bp. of Carlisle.

where between one-sixth and one-seventh are provided for, and the destitute but 9000.

And now, to sum up these miserable items of deficiency, in *nine*

* Archdeacon Thorp's Charge, p. 6.

† The Bishop of Durham, though not impropriator, would, on the ground of patronage or property, be enabled by the act 1 & 2 Will. IV. c. 45, to augment Stockton, Newburn, and Alnwick, out of the leased property of the see. See a valuable statistic account given by the Marquis of Londonderry on occasion of his motion on the Durham Ecclesiastical Revenues, July 21, 1836.—*Mirr. of Parl.* 2469.

towns in the single diocese of Durham there are 110,000,—in *nine* more (four of them in the one district of Jarrow) there are above 37,000,—in all, there are by this time far above 150,000, virtually excommunicated by the Church without any fault of theirs. No wonder then that Satan seized many, whom the Church has neglected to inclose within the fold, so that a judge* pronounced—

“ This county, though comparatively small, presents a larger display of atrocious crimes than the calendar of the Central Court of Middlesex has exhibited during the last twelve months. It is clear that religion and morality have not spoken to the hearts of so many offenders.”

To be measured with the metropolis, with its armies of thieves and its abodes of sin, and yet to be adjudged worse than it! We cannot think that the Commissioners could have realized this, when they recommended that 39,686*l.* of the revenues of Durham should be removed from the diocese, above one-half its episcopal revenues be taken away, with the vague promise of first “ considering the places whence the revenue was derived.” We cannot think, with these appalling facts really present to their minds, they could have ventured upon such an act of injustice, as to recommend that the property which Durham needed, should be taken from her, that the wealth which accrued from her collieries should be taken to supply other places, and they, whose strength is expended to obtain it, be left unsupplied. And yet no one can think that were this sum “ abstracted ” from her, any fair proportion would be returned, or her children provided for by strangers as by their natural parents. One cannot doubt that comparisons would come in; and yet, since the funds come from Durham, any thing short of what would be allotted to her, if there were no wants in the whole of England but her’s, would be unjust; it would be to withhold from her, her own. It is not for us to advise men, liberal as the chapter of Durham; but the monks in the West of England, who, when they dreaded Henry’s grasp, erected monuments to themselves in the beautiful towers, which they added to their churches, and so in some measure eluded the spoiler, gave a worthy example to follow. They put some of their property, at least, in safe keeping, and are remembered with gratitude.

This plan of spoliation is unwise, as well as cruel and unjust. Let but an example be set, of providing such a population as that of the diocese of Durham adequately with ministers, and we might look to see such a mighty spirit of emulation stirred in our

* Quoted by Mr. Lambton, in his motion in behalf of the See of Durham, in the Committee on the Established Church Bill, July 12, 1836.—*Mirr. of Parl.* 2349.

whole land, as should give a new spring and life to our whole Christian existence; scatter it, and you will sow your land with salt, dry up the springs of Christian charity, or give them a bitter taste. Like begets like; let the diocese of Durham be furnished with pastors on a noble scale, and others will "see the good work and glorify our Father which is in heaven;" let its property be parcelled out among the towns of England whose it is not, and which ought to be supplied by other means, and they will be apt scholars in learning the trade of beggary; will wait for their vineyard to be tilled by the labour of others, until it bring forth again its thorns and briers. To pull down an ancient consecrated building, is to lay but an ill foundation of that we would raise. *Diruit, ædificat*, was a very proverb for instability. "Every wise woman buildeth her house, but the foolish plucketh it down with her hands." We cannot conceive a plan better devised to stifle the noble spirit which is now beginning to rise among us, than to heap upon it this fuel, which is not its own. Rather let it find vent in its own way, and it will burn up more steadily and more brightly. It ought to be a first principle in any arrangement that may be made, that the foundations of every place should provide for its own wants,* Durham for Durham; London for London. If we guarantee to those places, which have foundations, their property uninjured, others will spring up; it was thus that these foundations themselves arose: by a holy emulation, not by plundering one another. It was through keeping faithfully, as a sacred deposit, that which was committed to them, that they received more; others saw the institutions flourish, and longed to be authors of the like; and so they increased and filled the land, and were the salt of the earth.

The highest act of faith were the ancient way of giving unto the treasury of the bishop for him to dispense to his diocese; but this was not required; every one has his own way of viewing and doing things; one would found schools, another colleges, another hospitals, a fourth a monastery, a fifth a parochial church; one would leave the fellowship, which he founded, for the whole of England, another wished to secure a benefit for his native county or the grammar-school at which he had himself been instructed: and thus, while each followed his own natural bent, some, it may be, with more expansive views than others, others

* "It is an imbecile way in order to found a See at Manchester, to take from the revenues of bishoprics. No; let men go and preach in the streets of Manchester: they would be pelted. Never mind; in time, persons would attend to them, and rich people would leave their money, first one, and then another. Every place should support its own church."—*Froude's Remains*, v. 1, p. 434. As it is, the "pelting," by all accounts, seems likely enough to happen; but without the honour of founding a bishopric.

again with a more affectionate and simple gratitude to the spot which God had made the channel of His goodness to them. The wants of all were ministered to by that which each supplied; some it may be more richly than others; but the richer were no injury to the poorer, nor did the poorer envy the richer, but rather "the whole body fitly joined together by that which every joint supplied, according to the effectual working of every part, made increase of the body to the edifying of itself in love."

This it has been the wisdom of the Church, and a righteous act on her part, to retain: it may be that *we* might think some of the gifts might have been more judiciously disposed; yet she felt a noble confidence that things would in the end work best, if allowed to work according to the measure of insight which God had given to those whose hearts He had stirred: and obviously the common wants would thus be supplied more completely than if one mind were set up as the measure of all. The contributions for the building of the tabernacle* furnish a striking type for the variety of Christian service;—

"And they came, every one whose heart stirred him up, and every one whom his spirit made willing, and they brought the Lord's offering to the work of the tabernacle of the congregation, and for all his service, and for the holy garments. And they came, both men and women, as many as were willing-hearted, and brought bracelets, and earrings, and rings, and tablets, all jewels of gold: and every man that offered, offered an offering of gold unto the Lord. And every man, with whom was found blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine linen, and goats' hair, and red skins of rams, and badgers' skins, brought them. Every one that did offer an offering of silver and brass brought the Lord's offering: and every man, with whom was found shittim wood for any work of the service, brought it. And all the women that were wise hearted did spin with their hands, and brought that which they had spun, both of blue, and of purple, and of scarlet, and of fine linen. And all the women whose heart stirred them up in wisdom spun goats' hair. And the rulers brought onyx stones, and stones to be set, for the ephod, and for the breastplate; and spice, and oil for the light, and for the anointing oil, and for the sweet incense."

Yet all, from the goats' hair which the women spun to the precious stones which were set in the breastplate of the high-priest, had their place and were accepted. And so the offerings of our forefathers. Their offerings were more valuable the one than the other; but he who brought the lesser, brought what would have still been missed, and which by others might have been overlooked, and by all God was glorified, and all are entered in His book.

* Exodus, xxxv. 21—28.

We, certainly,—to judge from the way in which people speak, or in which we act,—should not have endowed Winwick with her large lands, which their piety bestowed; and we should think it an extravagance of service to inclose some little spot, containing but 112 souls, and to give it its own peculiar pastor; but they learnt of Him, who bestows his gifts with a rich (so to speak) prodigality of beneficence, pouring them out on all sides, decking with glorious profusion the deep-hidden valley, or mountain recess, “where mortal foot hath ne’er or rarely been,” and not regarding though they be, as it seems to us, lost or excessive. And such as they gave them, it were our faithfulness and wisdom to retain them; so, if we be faithful to our stewardship, shall we be entrusted with that which is now lacking to us.

The Commissioners say,*

“It is to be hoped that the sacrifices which will be required from the cathedral and collegiate churches of the country, will have the effect of stimulating individual benevolence to contribute towards the accomplishment of these most important ends.”

But they have confounded two very different things. “Sacrifices made *by* the cathedral and collegiate churches,” such as those which Durham has made and is making, *will* and have had the effect of stimulating individual benevolence, their self-denying contributions towards the spiritual benefit of others, will excite others to “follow their good example;” sacrifice of self will teach others sacrifice of self; “but sacrifices made *of* the cathedral and collegiate churches,” sacrifices made by those to whom it costs nothing, are neither acceptable to God, nor will they teach man any thing, but to do the like, i. e. make sacrifices, not of his own, but of others. When the cathedral and collegiate churches have thus been “sacrificed,” people will look out for some fresh victim to offer upon the altar of their own indolence, but they will never learn in this way, to make unto God the acceptable sacrifice of themselves, or to “offer to Him of His own.” Already they have begun. The tallest flowers in our garden, the remnant of days in which it was more duly cultivated, have had their heads struck off; the next have been marked out to be mown down; and so they will follow on still, faithfully executing the precept of the Roman king, ever mowing off the highest which remains, until all be one waste. From the Archbishoprics or the Bishoprics of Ely or Durham, they were led on to the cathedrals; and now they go on where those, who have led them thus far, would fain have stopped them, and talk of the “waste” of income upon Winwick, or Stanhope, or Doddington.† And if *their* incomes were dispersed,

* Report II, p. 8.

† See Speeches in the House of Commons quoted above.

then to the next class below them; and so on, until they should bring down all the munificence of our ancestors to one low level, nor leave one favoured spot amid their wilderness. It is too plain that, besides the supposed benefits of the property to be obtained from the cathedrals, some of the Commissioners thought it an advantage to be freed from the odium of their wealth; they thought probably that they should obtain readier contributions, if this wealth were more evenly distributed, that if this store were dissipated, others would be found to bring fresh supplies more liberally; they thought it a positive good to be rid of the cathedrals, and would say, "now there is not this disproportionate wealth, we have done what we could, now come and help us." They wholly miscalculated human nature, and have admitted a mischievous principle against themselves; they have not effaced, they have scarcely diminished, the inequality. While livings vary from below 10*l.* to 7306*l.* (Doddington), or while people can say that a Dean of Durham is left worth ten times a Dean of Chester,* or can refer to the 15,000*l.* per annum "assigned to the Archbishop of Canterbury," nothing is done towards it; the "love of money" is to be cured not by giving "money," but by correcting the "love;" this desire of obtaining necessary aid by means which shall "cost them nothing," not by sacrificing the cathedrals, but by bidding them to go and do likewise, or by sacrificing ourselves.

Extreme parties often render good service by exhibiting the tendencies of things which in the less consistent remain undeveloped; they are consistent even if it be in evil, and so track out for us beforehand whither our path would lead us. There is no difference of principle, as Mr. Buxton well pointed out, between the dismembring the cathedrals and reducing the wealthy livings; make up but the patronage to the individuals, (as was proposed towards the crown and done towards the bishops,) and the thing is settled;† augment six or twelve "poor and populous parishes"

* "The assignment of these unequal incomes (the new arrangement of the Commission) is equivalent to saying that a Dean of Durham is worth ten Deans of Chester and a Canon of Durham is worth a dozen Canons of Chester in their reforming times, and all for no other reason, which I can devise, than that in earlier times a Dean of Durham was worth twenty Deans of Chester, and so on in proportion."—*Mr. F. Buxton, 1836, Mirror of Parliament, 2288.* Undoubtedly this was the reason, and it was a sufficient reason that the founder of Durham had bestowed twenty times as much on Durham as he of Chester on Chester; but by remodelling the incomes at all, they cut away the ground from under their feet.

† A plan of this kind has actually been devised by a well-meaning Clergyman (who talks very quietly of "the Cathedral Fund.") "A few Suggestions for increasing the Incomes of many of the smaller Livings, for the almost total Abolition of Pluralities, and for promoting the residence of Ministers in the several Parishes, more particularly addressed to the Members of both Houses of Parliament." He fell into the usual error of regarding patronage as the only point to be considered, instead of the right of the several places to the incomes accruing from them.

with the surplus of Doddington, and half the number with that of Winwick, and give the "patronage" to their patrons; and on *this* scheme, they are unreasonable if they refuse it, and should be compelled; on the profit and loss scheme the livings would even be more marketable commodities than before.

The question then, now about to be decided, is not simply (momentous as that is) about the cathedral churches; it is not between the deans and chapters and the Commission; we may hope that the miserable necessity of remonstrance, and opposition to a body, in which some of our bishops had consented to take a part, is at an end; their schemes have passed into other hands, and are already receiving a development, which they did not contemplate. Both the Plurality and anti-Cathedral bills are lay bills. The question is about the "WHOLE TENURE AND DISTRIBUTION OF CHURCH PROPERTY AND THE WHOLE LEGISLATIVE FOR THE CHURCH. It is whether the Church is ever hereafter to legislate for herself, either in synod or convocation, or to have her services, her ordinances, and her creeds,* at the disposal of the state; whether she is to retain her liberty which Christ confided to her, or to be "in bondage with her children" to those who are not of her. It is, again, whether we are to be allowed, by sacrificing of our own, to establish a memorial for ever to our Maker's praise, or whether whatever has been dedicated to His service, becomes public property, the property of man and of the state, to deal with as it pleases; it is whether the earth and the Church are man's or God's. It is assumed, as a first principle, in this re-distribution of the Church's property at the hands of the state, that property is a creature of the state, that it so belongs to the state as that its present possessors have no right to alienate it from it, and dedicate it to God; that the state not only protects us in its possession, but that we hold it of it, and not of God. It steps in between us and our Maker, and says, "You shall not employ it to such and such ends, you shall put nothing out of my control; I am sovereign dispenser, and who is Lord over me?" Both these things are involved in principle; if the state may scatter the property which our northern ancestors, in the diocese of Durham, dedicated to God's service in their own homes, and may portion it out in Cheshire or Lancashire, then the remainder is matter of time only; it is the first letting out of water, and it will continue to flow, as it may be, more or less rapidly, until all have passed

* "If you mean to conciliate that portion of the Dissenters, who have always shown the sincerest attention to the Church, you must revise your Liturgy and your Articles. Why can you not remove from it those things which are so much objected to, for instance, the Athanasian Creed, the Communion, and other things."—*Mr. Poulter on 2nd Reading of Established Church Bill, 1835. Mirr. of Parl. 2379.*

out of our possession, into the new receptacle which the state has made for it. There will be no further question of principle; it will be matter of detail only and of expediency. Either all is secured, because it has been dedicated for ever by those who were entrusted with it and with the power of disposing of it, or none; either it is to be retained for the uses for which they gave it, or if the state may alter the application in the one case, it may in another. It may just as well appropriate the revenues of Durham for some scheme of national education, as for providing or eking out the salaries of ministers in Lancashire or Cheshire; and in time it WILL. Again, if the state may prescribe to us what number of sermons we shall preach to our flocks, and set a lay-commission over our bishops, it may prescribe any thing else,—at least to such portion of the Church as shall retain any connection with it, and may be their bishop.

We firmly trust, however, that, like all similar attempts of late, this too will rather end in the strengthening of the Church, in clearing men's views as to her nature and office, and the means of benefitting her; and so what is evil in these bills will rather turn to her good. The very struggle about the preservation of the cathedrals has had its use; the body of cathedral clergy have been called to re-examine the nature of their institutions,* their duties, and responsibilities, and the means of fulfilling them. While impressing upon others the importance of their office in the Church, they have probably deepened their own consciousness of it; they have professed themselves ready to make sacrifices, and when the time comes, will make them.

The way of a mixed Commission has been tried, and satisfied none. Let the bishops resume their consultations as a body, either privately as they were wont, or more formally in synod, and the clergy will place full confidence in them. The change in the disposition of the funds of the Church has failed, and well-nigh shaken the security of all the property of the Church; let them try what the mere putting in force existing responsibilities will do. Let our bishops resume their plan of giving back their impropriations (we say not, as some of them did, "in whole," but) in such part as is needed, to the poor or populous parishes which shall need them: this voluntary bounty of theirs, *which they have held out to the clergy*, will be received with affectionate gratitude by them, and bind them the more to their considerate diocesans. It will not be the gift only, but the gift as coming from the giver,

* We are glad here to name a few pages, which have just reached us, "Suggestions arising out of the proposed Alterations in the Cathedral Establishments of England and Wales." By C. A. Moysey, D.D., Archdeacon of Bath.

which will be prized; and it will augment also the virtual resources of the Church. Then, when they have digested this plan among themselves, let them consult, in mutual confidence, with the several chapters, or other ecclesiastical bodies or individuals possessing impropriations, and examine in detail what and how much may be done for the Church generally, through the places with which they are connected. We are convinced, upon examination, that far more may be done in this way, and that without injury to the chapters, than would at first sight appear. For we hold the responsibility of the chapters to extend, not simply to places whereof they have the patronage, but to all of which they have the impropriations, and in these, not merely to provide *one* minister with his income proportionate to his labours or the importance of his office, but with such number of ministers as may be necessary.

They received the tithes on the express condition of providing for the spiritual instruction of the place, and if this could not be effected without the sacrifice of the whole amount of any given portion of tithes, they must (as in some cases has been done by chapters) be sacrificed. (We put this as an extreme case, though by the wise provisions of the Archbishop's Act; it would seldom prove necessary). Thus, to revert again to the diocese of Chester, the Cathedral of Christ Church is obviously responsible for the whole townships of Budworth, 15,955; Runcorn, 10,326; Frodsham, 5547; Rostherne, 3730; Knutsford, 3326; Kirkham, 11,640; as the see of Canterbury for Blackburn, 59,791; and Rochdale, 34,277; Trinity College, Cambridge, for Kendal, 17,427; King's College for Prescott, 28,084; for Manchester, 270,961, as far as it could extend its Collegiate Church. If this were done, the benefits conferred on the immediate places would be the least portion of the good resulting. What is felt to be now every where wanting, is a sufficient stimulus to great exertion; we are just waking (all alike, it is not one class only) from the torpor which seemed to press upon the whole of the 18th century; ordinary means will not suffice; our exertions, on which we congratulate ourselves, do not by any means keep pace even with the increase of our wants; we are losing ground, year by year: yet there is an awakening desire to do something to enlarge the efficiency of our Church, and extend her fostering care to all her children. What we want then is something to direct this, and give it a bolder essay and a loftier impulse, to raise the standards by which people should measure the supply of spiritual wants; to furnish them a pattern which to copy. It is admitted by the Commissioners that even if 130,000*l.* were raised from the confiscations, it would fall miserably short of what we need; it

would raise the incomes, for instance, of half the parishes in England which need such supply, on a graduated scale of 150*l.*, 200*l.*, 300*l.*, 400*l.*, and leave the other half where they were, and our large populations totally unsupplied, and ourselves exhausted. The funds of charity are inexhaustible.

"Where," asks Dr. Spry,* "is the policy of thus deluding the friends of the Church with the prospect of funds which are partly imaginary, and will be wholly inefficient, and thus checking the munificent spirit of which such noble examples are daily exhibited, and leaning upon expedients of questionable policy, and doubtful equity, when the piety and liberality of the nation, appealed to properly and duly encouraged, offers immediate and inexhaustible resources? It is impossible to doubt the effect of such an appeal, even if now made, and accompanied with a declaration that its success would save these venerable establishments from ruin, and secure an object which their ruin could not effect. Nor can it be supposed that the different chapters of England would be unwilling to devote a liberal portion of their revenues to the increase of a parochial ministry, if they were consulted on that subject by their diocesans, and duly excited by that magnificent liberality which the prelates of England on every fit occasion are so ready to display. Surely it would be well at least to try the effect of such an appeal, for was it but moderately successful, a sum would be speedily obtained far exceeding any thing which the spoliation of Cathedral and Collegiate establishments can for many years supply, and the Church would be preserved in her integrity."

On the other hand, when the present rising feeling should be fanned into a flame, by the sacrifices of our bishops in the first instance, and then of the cathedral or collegiate bodies, and men saw what could be done, and had patterns worthy of old times set before them, the light would spread from city to city, until the blaze encircled our whole land, and penetrated every corner which was capable of receiving it; and deeds worthy of the old days of the Church would be done, and the riches now locked up would again flow freely for the good of the Church, and the days of her youth might return. The abundance of charity is not merely inexhaustible; it grows by being drained: it strengthens by exhausting exertion. The inadequacy of our endeavours dispirits and disheartens us, and makes us incapable of great things. We move stiffly and cramped for want of adequate exercise. The property of our bishoprics and cathedrals is spread over the whole of England, as it would seem for the very purpose of furnishing so many centres of Christian exertion, so many patterns each in its own neighbourhood. The 120 or 130,000*l.* would be long ere it was obtained, and when obtained would soon disappear; the good example set in providing South

* Observations, p. 25, 26.

Shields, or Newcastle, or Rochdale, or Blackburn, with pastors would have an abundant offspring of similar deeds; it would make more available what we have,* and would obtain for us fresh supplies.† We doubt not that very many among the richer impropiators would gladly make restitution, and for the poorer, who came lawfully by property, which to the state is unlawful, and which is a curse upon the nation, the Church might come to the state, not as suppliants, but claiming justice and re-demand of it her own; and we doubt not the righteous claim would in time be heard, where petitions for eleemosynary assistance would be disregarded.

The maintenance, then, of our cathedrals‡ is the common cause of the Church; their proposed reduction is the first step in the "reconstruction" of the Church, whereby it is to rest, not "on the apostles and prophets," but on the fiat of the state. The cathedrals are the common patrimony of all; while kept entire, they are the best earnest, that the liberality which founded them, shall, through them, again revive; they are memorials and fragments of a better part, and heralds of a brighter morrow; if destroyed, or mutilated, in that proportion will the standard of future munificence be lowered.

We have, in this statement, purposely confined ourselves to the one main principle of the *sacredness* of foundations; the arguments, from their utility or necessity, have never been answered; but we do not wish to defend them on these grounds. This would be to appeal to the judgment of man, as though, if he

* The mother Church of our great towns is frequently well endowed; but habit occasions men to go on with their one or two curates, when they might maintain ten or twelve, and yet leave themselves a competency such as the chief minister should have. This would be broken through, if a better system were somewhere introduced, as through the bishops and cathedrals it might.

† The repeal of the Statute of Mortmain would facilitate this. Bishop Kennett (*Cases of Impropriations*, p. 390, sqq.) shows that its object was to protect the rights of the crown, which now no longer exist, and its present unreasonableness. Its very meaning is now vulgarly misunderstood; it was to prevent property passing into "dead hands," i. e. such as did not contribute to the defence of the state. Impropriations may be restored at present to the places whence they accrue, notwithstanding the Statute of Mortmain.

‡ It is with much satisfaction that we find that their cause is to be pleaded before the House of Lords and the Judges; and we trust, that the parochial clergy will not allow it to be stated, as it was in the alterations of the bishoprics, that "the Church" was favorable to the plan. Petitions, impressing a few strong principles, such as the inviolability of our foundations; the non-interference of Parliament, (especially as at present constituted,) except in *confirming* the acts of the Church; the revocation of the Parliamentary Commission; and the repeal of so much of the Established Church Act (6 & 7 Will. IV. c. 77) as relates to the *forcible* remodelling of the incomes of our bishops; the restoration of the Church property held by the Crown; should be sent to that House or to the Crown by all who have the stability of our Church at heart. One against the Commission is, we are glad to see, put forth by the Bath Church of England Lay Association.

thought them useful, they were to be retained, if he, on the scant measure of the present day, thought otherwise, to be destroyed. We do not take men as the arbiters; we appeal to One higher than they. The question of utility is not open; the cathedrals were useful when employed aright; they may have been useless or injurious, if misemployed by their patrons; we claim them to be retained and filled aright; we do not wish our cathedrals to be left on grounds of utilitarianism; but we claim them on grounds of eternal justice, because our forefathers founded them *for ever* to the honour and praise of God, and laid an adjuration on posterity to retain them inviolate. Such adjuration no country violated, and was held guiltless. "DEUS," says the sublime simplicity of ancient English law,

" DEUS HÆREDEM FACIT, NON HOMO."

Whoso violates the inheritance of the Church, his inheritance shall be violated. Whatever nation shall give other heirs to the institutions dedicated to ALMIGHTY GOD, shall He, in the energetic language of Israel, "give heirs to," i. e. "cast them out and place others in their room."

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

"The Beast and his Image ;" or the Pope and the Council of Trent. With the Number, Name, and Mark of the Pope, and the Mark of his Name in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. Being a Commentary upon Revelation xiii. By Frederic Fysh, M. A., of Queen's College, Cambridge. Seeley and Burnside. 1837.

"It is not," the preface assures us, "without much reluctance and many misgivings that the author of the following Commentary ventures to obtrude it on the notice of the Christian public. Deeply sensible of his own incompetency to the office of Commentator on the Book of Revelation, he has at times felt disposed to shrink from the task; but has been encouraged to proceed, trusting to the assistance of Him whose prerogative it is, by things which are not, to bring to nought things that are."

Now what does this mean? If Mr. Fysh speaks the truth when he professes to be deeply sensible of his own incompetency to comment on the Revelation, how comes it that he has published a great octavo of between five and six hundred pages, "being a Commentary" on that part of the Scripture? He sometimes felt disposed to shrink from doing it: he actually does it with "*much reluctance and many misgivings*;" but somehow or other—by some persons or some means, he has been encouraged to proceed. If he was encouraged by persons calling themselves friends, we would caution him against listening to those who must be either very incompetent advisers or very malicious hoaxers. If he means that he was encouraged by the passage of Scripture to which he has referred, there is no use in arguing with him. If he supposes, that because it is the prerogative of God to make use of things that are foolish and weak, and base and despised, it is our business to follow after those things,—that, in mere dependence on the over-ruling power of Omnipotence, we are, in spite of the reluctance and misgivings of conscience and common sense, to set about that to which we really think ourselves incompetent,—if the author means any thing like this, it may be in itself sufficient to enable the reader to judge how far he is qualified to interpret the Scriptures at all.

But this is most abundantly shown by the book itself, which consists principally of the old plan of interpretation which has within these thirty years been hashed up from Mede and Bishop Newton, with every variety of sauce and flavour; the artist commonly supposing that he had something of his own to offer, in the way of alteration or addition, which would make it worth while to reprint all the rest. But let us take one or two specimens.

"The sixth vial is to be taken both *symbolically* and *literally*. The Mahomedan empire is the symbolic Euphrates, as the Papal empire, or the Papacy, is, symbolically, the Beast, and Rome, Babylon. The Ottoman empire, the mystical Euphrates, is now drying up, and therefore the destruction

of the Papacy draweth nigh. The Pope is only to practise 'five months,' or 150 years longer; and, when Halley's comet shall have completed two more revolutions, then will come the downfall of the papacy."—p. 217.

"In the year 1987, the theme of so many prophecies, the Papacy receives its death-blow. Since the Pope was '*the eighth*' head of Rome in the year 727, the 1260 years allotted to his empire must terminate A. D. 1987. Let Roman Catholics keep in mind the figures 1—9—8—7. There is a remarkable fatality connected with these figures. Let us transpose the three figures 9—8—7, placing 7 for the first figure. We have thus two permutations, 7—8—9 and 7—9—8. Have Roman Catholics forgotten the years 1789 and 1798? Have they forgotten the vials which were poured out in those years?" p. 208.

"It is, however, remarkable, that whilst Mr. Faber makes the year 1896 a fatal year, because it is 1290 years from the year 606 [if we recollect right, among the fluctuations of Mr. Faber's system, one is, that he has abandoned this year, for which he so long contended, and taken 604. Mr. Fysh seems not to be aware, that in quoting writers of this class it is absolutely necessary to use the newest edition], we have put down the following year, viz. 1897, as a fatal year, *because* it contains the fatal figures 1—7—8—9."—p. 253.

"It is well known that רומיית *Romiith*, which is the Hebrew for *Roman*, contains the number 666: but then it is in the *feminine* gender. How then can it be the name of a *man*? Mr. Faber gives the point up in despair. He says, 'it most certainly is *not* the name of a *man*.' All agree that *Romiith* is the name of the *Beast*, considered as a *Beast* or *Kingdom*, which in Hebrew are both *feminine*. If then it is the name of the *Beast*, it *must be the name of a Man*. However difficult and inexplicable this appears, the words of Scripture are most express. '*Here is wisdom. Let him that hath understanding count the number of the Beast; for it is the number of a Man; and his number is six hundred, threescore and six.*' We were many times tempted to give up the solution of this mystery in despair, but the words of Scripture still presented themselves, '*Let God be true, and every man a liar.*' We were also convinced, that in the solution of this enigma would be found the true answer to the question, *What is the mark of the Name of the Beast?* At length, by the blessing of God, the truth flashed upon our mind, and we saw that the number of *the Beast*, or the number of the name of *the Beast*, is indeed the number of a *MAN*, or the number of the name of a *MAN*. At the same time we found out the *MARK OF HIS NAME*."—p. 515.

Does the reader want more?

"The subject is not yet exhausted. The name of the Pope and of every Latin Bishop, may be expressed thus:

"LATINUS R. R.
OR LATINUS RECTE REVERENDUS.

"Let every Romish Bishop attend to this! His signature is 'A Right Reverend Latin' [and in right reverend Latin too], and this contains the number 666!"—p. 523.

A Grammar of the New Testament Dialect. By Moses Stuart, Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary, Andover, U.S. London: Stewart. 1838. 12mo. pp. 238.

WE regard the popularity of the works of this writer as no matter for congratulation. The editor of the little volume before us, refers us for "evidence of the author's qualifications," to his Commentaries on the Epistles to the Hebrews and the Romans. We candidly confess, that we want other evidence of Mr. Stuart's qualifications for the business of sacred criticism, than is afforded by works which carefully inculcate the Sabellian and Pelagian heresies. In the compilation of the present work, Mr. Stuart evinces a considerable acquaintance with the labours of the recent scholars of Germany. But he should have remembered, that the merits of those eminent philologists cannot be successfully emulated by the mere affectation of systematic accuracy. His book is too elementary to be acceptable to the scholar, while it is too minute and technical for the less ambitious students whose wishes do not extend beyond the acquirement of a moderate acquaintance with the language of the New Testament.

An Universal History, from the Creation to A. D. 1828, divided into Twenty-one Periods, at the most remarkable Epochs of the World. By Edward Quin, M. A., of Magdalen Hall, Oxford; and Barrister at Law, of the Hon. Soc. of Lincoln's Inn. Seeley and Burnside. 1838. 12mo. pp. 367.

THIS volume is intended to accompany an "Historical Atlas," by the same author, which has been some time before the public. We know not with what success Mr. Quin has executed the former part of his task, but with the aid of the valuable labours of Kruse, he could hardly fail of producing an useful work. We can scarcely award to his present attempt any high degree of commendation. We are not so unreasonable as to expect every outline of general history to exhibit the genius of Bossuet. And elegance and correctness of style are matters of minor importance in what is at most but an index. But we cannot dispense with accuracy. A very slight knowledge of Greek might have preserved him from telling his readers that Constantine V. was "surnamed Copronymus, from his suppression of cloisters."—p. 96. And it did not require any very intimate acquaintance with the antiquities of the empire, to know that Constantine VI., who was born before his father became emperor, could not be "surnamed Porphyrogenitus."—p. 97.

Answer to Mr. Robert Haldane's Strictures on the Translation of Dr. Tholuck's Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans. By the Rev. Robert Menzies, the Translator. Edinburgh: Clark. 1838. 8vo. pp. 60.

THOUGH we regard with no little jealousy the attempts which have from time to time been made to introduce among us the principles of German theology, in the present instance we can hardly take part with Mr. Haldane. He was more profitably employed in denouncing Mr. Stuart, who is corrupting America, than in casting suspicion upon Dr. Tholuck, who is purifying Germany.

The System of National Education in Ireland: its Principles and Practice.

By J. C. Colquhoun, Esq., of Killermont, M. P. Cheltenham: Wight. 1838. 12mo. pp. 172.

It is truly gratifying to find an intelligent member of the legislature diligently applying himself to the collecting of evidence on a subject so important as national education. But Mr. Colquhoun must allow us to express our regret that the force of his argument is sometimes diminished by over-statement and violence. We yield to none in our dislike to the errors of Romanism; but we cannot allow that "the system of the Roman Catholic Church, like that of the Pagan or the Hindoo, is a sheer piece of priestcraft," or that "the Popish priests occupy the position which the Etrurian priests did in Italy before the Roman republic, which their augurs continued to do through the history of Rome."—p. 70.

An Inquiry into the Doctrine of the Eternal Sonship of our Lord Jesus Christ.

By Richard Treffry, jun. London: Mason. 1837. 12mo. pp. xxxix. 508.

THERE are circumstances connected with this work which we are glad to have an opportunity to notice. It is probably known to many of our readers, and it ought to be known generally, that the Wesleyan Methodists were some years ago disturbed by the persevering efforts of certain persons of great name in their society, especially the late Dr. Adam Clarke, to introduce among them dangerous notions respecting the Divine Nature of the Saviour. The persons in question, restrained by no feelings of veneration for Catholic truth, and determined boldly to exercise their right of private judgment or infallibility, persuaded themselves that the Eternal Generation of the Word is not a doctrine of the Gospel, and with the perverse activity characteristic of heresy, zealously laboured to propagate their error among those subject to their influence. They met with an able antagonist in the late Mr. Watson, then the leader of the Methodist body. But the controversy appears lately to have revived. The heretical party, encouraged by the popularity of the works of Stuart, the semi-neological Professor at Andover, U. S., have again industriously exerted themselves to diffuse their Sabellian opinions. It would seem that they have been but too successful. Mr. Treffry informs us, that "already it is triumphantly announced [that] *the mass of Christians out of the Establishment deny that our Lord Jesus Christ is the Eternal Son of God!*" Although we sincerely hope with Mr. Treffry, that this "startling representation is grossly exaggerated," such language would scarcely have been used if the mischief had not widely extended. This new instance of that *constant tendency to heresy*, which has been ever remarkable in the religious communities not connected with the Church, requires no comment.

The work before us, which is written by a Methodist minister, is a defence of the Catholic doctrine against the persons who hold the errors in question. It is a very creditable performance. Every modern work on such a subject, of course provokes an invidious comparison with the labours of Pearson, Bull, and Waterland. But we are not disposed to measure Mr. Treffry by an in-

equitable standard. We could have wished that he had written on what we deem safer principles ; but he has read to advantage, and has produced an useful work. We trust it may, in every sense, be successful.

Village Lectures on the Litany, preached in the Parish Church of Stifford, Essex.

By the Reverend William Palin, B. A., Rector. London : Parker. 1837. 12mo. pp. 156.

THIS little work is a pleasing attempt to explain the Litany to a country congregation. We could wish that the amiable author entertained more worthy notions of "the Holy Catholic Church;" but his "Lectures" are written in a gentle and unpretending manner, and seem well calculated to afford assistance in the important duty of domestic instruction.

Connected Essays and Tracts, being a Series of Inferences, deduced chiefly from the Principles of the most celebrated Sceptics ; containing, I. Observations on the Foundation of Morals in Human Nature ; II. A digressive Essay upon some Metaphysical Paradoxes ; III. A Treatise on the Evidences of Revelation in the Scheme of Nature. And an Appendix of two Dissertations, containing some Remarks on the Question of Materialism, and the present aspect of that Controversy ; and a brief Review of Hume's Natural History of Religion ; with Notes upon various incidental Subjects. By Henry O'Connor, Esq., Barrister at Law. Dublin : Hodges and Smith ; Whittaker, London. 1837. 8vo. pp. 344.

THE trenchant manner in which Mr. O'Connor handles some great names in theological literature, is a bad example to critics. But we are always so glad to find lay Christians exerting themselves against the enemies of religion, that we shall not be provoked to severity, though we freely confess we cannot approve of some of the tenets advanced in his work. As the third Essay, he tells us, is the one "to which all the other speculations of this volume are intended to be ancillary," we will extract the words in which he "declares its design." "As it must be admitted that the human species is possessed of peculiar characteristics, which constitute a natural difference between ours and every other species, so it is a proposition equally axiomatical, although less frequently regarded, that these characteristic principles of our species have the nature and force of divine laws, directing the creature to that peculiar mode of life, which the Creator designed it to pursue. Such rules of action we cannot suppose to be so repugnant and incongruous in themselves, that the slightest accordance with one of them must infer the total violation of another. This sort of confusion, which indeed never disgraced a code of human jurisprudence, does not exist through all the diversified grades of animal life, nor can a similar inconsistency be detected in the conformation of any natural production, vegetable or inert. In the fabric of the world, there is no such clashing of incompatible principles, nor jarring of contradictory intentions. The mechanism of matter, and of mental being, is consistent and harmonious. The chorus of nature joins in perfect concord ; and that the existence of religious feelings in the human mind, forms no exception to the universal har-

mony, is the chief object of the present Essay to illustrate and maintain."—pp. 106, 107.

Sermons, Doctrinal and Practical. By the Rev. J. E. Riddle, M.A. of St. Edmund Hall, Oxford; Curate of Harrow. London. Hatchards. 1838. 8vo. pp. 343.

THESE are earnest and impressive Sermons. Mr. Riddle's good taste has preserved him from the inflation and extravagance which have of late been too frequent in volumes of a similar nature.

Colloquies: Imaginary Conversations between a Phrenologist and the shade of Dugald Stewart. By J. Slade, M.D., F.G.S., M.P.S.L. London. Parbury. 1838. 12mo. pp. 336.

WE have never seen the notions of the Phrenologists explained more unobjectionably than they are in this little work. But we cannot congratulate the amiable author on the success with which he has managed the imaginative part of his subject. The fiction is insipid, and the dialogue wants the qualities most indispensable in that difficult species of composition.

The Illustrated Family Bible, containing the Old and New Testaments, &c. &c.; with the Self-Interpreting and Explanatory Notes, and Marginal References of the late Rev. John Brown, Minister of the Gospel at Haddington; to which is appended a complete Concordance to the Old and New Testament. Smith, Elder & Co. 1838.

THIS is a very splendid reprint of a Commentary on the Bible, which has long been in some degree of repute among the Dissenters. Though, if we remember right, there was a good deal of difficulty in disposing of the edition published some years ago by Dr. Raffles. Perhaps the typographical beauty of this edition (for it is singularly beautiful as to printing, though we cannot admire the taste of the decorations, and are old-fashioned enough to prefer the vermillion, to the carmine tint, for the rubric, if our dissenting friends will allow us so to call it) may render it more successful. The cover informs us, that it is "dedicated to her most gracious Majesty Queen Victoria," and it contains what is, we presume, a portrait of her Majesty in a small medallion. To us, who consider this as the oddest and most observable thing about the work, it would have been more satisfactory if it had been said whether it was dedicated *with* or *without* permission; and, if the former, with what degree of explanation that permission was sought.

The Lives of Dr. John Donne, Sir Henry Wotton, Mr. Richard Hooker, Mr. George Herbert, and Dr. Robert Sanderson. By Izaak Walton. A new Edition, with Illustrative Notes and Plates. Washbourne. 1838. 8vo. pp. 424.

As to the work itself, any remark would be superfluous; as to this edition, it seems to us to be singularly beautiful, and to do great credit to the publisher. The embellishments are numerous and interesting.

A Brief History of Church Rates, proving the liability of a Parish to them to be a Common Law liability; including a Reply to the Statements on that Subject in Sir John Campbell's Letter to the Right Hon. Lord Stanley, on the Law of Church Rates. By the Rev. William Goode, M.A., of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Rector of St. Antholin, London. Hatchard. 1838. 8vo. pp. 76.

We are not quite sure whether law, or common sense, or argument, go for anything on this subject. If they should ever have their turn in the discussion of this question, Mr. Goode's little work will be found very valuable. As it is, however, without any very sanguine expectation of such a state of things, and also without professing to be lawyers enough to vouch for minutiae in such matters (though we know of no reason for the least doubt of accuracy), we strongly recommend the work to our readers.

Church Commission. Memorials and Communications from the Cathedral and Collegiate Churches in England and Wales: with an Appendix, relative to the Bishopric of Sodor and Man. Reprinted from Returns made to the Hon. the House of Commons, March 16, 1837, and ordered to be printed, April 14, and May 22. Rivingtons. 1838. 8vo. pp. 176.

We mention this work merely that our readers may know where to find these valuable and important documents, collected and arranged in a convenient form, and rendered still more convenient by an Index. They are not only in themselves a very interesting fact in the Church History of England, but they contain a vast deal of very curious information, which will be gratifying to students of that history, independent of the circumstances by which they have been elicited.

An Inquiry into the Nature and Prospects of the Adamite Race, as viewed in connection with the Scheme of Christianity. Whittaker. 1838.

We are at a loss to imagine why this book should have been sent to us. We must have written a great deal in vain, if we are supposed to believe, with the author, "that the benevolent Creator views the variety of creeds which are established among his creatures with complacency and tenderness."—p. 182.

We notice it, however, because it is always worth while to observe that those who wish to get rid of the doctrines, are generally obliged to begin by getting rid of the facts, and the letter, of Scripture. Of course, all that we read about the temptation and fall of man is merely figurative. Everything in the Garden of Eden, (except the literal man—in defiance of Bishop Horsley,) and even the Garden of Eden itself, is mere figure. "But, if we regard the words 'tree of life' as a figurative mode of speech, used to denote Christ's covenant of salvation, or some visible symbol by which that covenant was represented; and, if we regard the word *eat*, as applied to that 'tree,' merely as a figurative expression also, implying the *partaking of*, or *acquiring*, or *attaining to*, that eternal life which is imparted through Christ, (which is the sense in which St. John employs the word *eat* as applied to 'the tree of life,' of which he speaks, and which appears to be the only *rational* sense in which the word can be under-

stood as so applied in Genesis also); then, must we infer, that the words 'tree of the knowledge of good and evil' are used figuratively also, to express some representation of that 'knowledge,' which was fatal to the attainment of eternal life, of that 'knowledge,' the possession of which involved the loss, or the non-attainment, of that eternal life which was purchased by the sacrifice of Christ; and, that the word 'eat,' as applied to that 'tree of knowledge,' is also figuratively used, to express the acquisition, or reception, of that 'knowledge.'"—p. 63. A very *rational* way of interpreting Scripture certainly—and for every species of fanaticism or heresy, very convenient.

Isle of Man and Diocese of Sodor and Man. Ancient and authentic Records and Documents relating to the Civil and Ecclesiastical History of that Island. Collected and arranged by the Rev. William Percival Ward, M.A., Domestic Chaplain to the Bishop of Sodor and Man. Rivingtons. 1837. 8vo. pp. 186.

THIS little work does not require our recommendation, for, under present circumstances, the subject is enough to secure attention to every publication which relates to it. We must, however, thank Mr. Ward, not only for having collected so many interesting and valuable documents, and so much historical information, but for having given them to us in so pleasing, and, at the same time, so cheap a form.

The Lord Bishop of Ripon's Cobwebs to catch Calvinists; being a few Remarks on his Lordship's Questions to Candidates, at his late Ordination at Ripon. By a Clergyman of the Diocese. Simpkin and Marshall. 1838. 8vo. pp. 23.

WE have told our readers all that we know of this pamphlet by the mere act of giving them the title-page, which appeared to us so disgusting, that we did not look further into it. We presume, that the writer is some aggrieved Calvinist, who has been caught; but whether this is the case—or whether it is a gratuitous effusion of party—the writer ought to know, that the mere office of a bishop entitles him to be treated as a gentleman, even by those who are not gentlemen themselves. We say nothing, for we really know nothing, about the circumstances which have given rise to the pamphlet, and we are in no wise engaged to defend the conduct of the Bishop of Ripon, or any other bishop, in this, or in any other matter; but, be the bishop's conduct what it may, it cannot authorize any of his inferior clergy to show him up to the public, under the figure of a loathsome and despicable creeping thing, employed in spreading snares for the destruction of his brethren. Such humour should be confined to Sunday newspapers, and the other popular organs of a Mar-prelate age; and if ever it is taken up by the clergy, it ought to be met with unqualified disgust, and received as an avowal, that the cause in which it is employed is identified with the lowest radicalism. We do not know whether the title-page (for we are speaking of that only) is more or less discreditable for being anonymous.

INDEX

OF THE

REMARKABLE PASSAGES

IN THE

CRITICISMS, EXTRACTS, AND ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

A.

Act of Uniformity, observations on it, 76, 77.

Additional Curates' Fund, remarks upon its magnitude, and upon the spirit by which it has been raised, 184—nature of the purpose to which it is to be applied, 194.

Anderson (Rev. J. S.), sermons—their excellence, 103—extracts, 110-112.

Anquetil, on the building of the Egyptian Pyramids, 401.

Antiquity, deference due to it, 26-29.

Arabia, Syria, and Egypt, probability of their forming a new empire, 408, *note*.

Aristotle, admirable observation of his, 386—his moral philosophy contrasted with that of Plato, 392—element on which it was founded, 393, 428, 429.

Arminianism, derives no countenance from Scripture, 311.

Articles of the Church of England, their design misrepresented by Paley, 54—date of their first publication, 312—view of the Seventeenth Article, 313-315, 317.

Athanasian Creed, observations on its origin, 33, *note*.

Austin (St.), remarks of, on the observance of different customs in different Churches, 234, 235—charged with innovation by his contemporaries, with reference to his views of Election and Predestination, 302—examination of his claim to the suffrages of Cyprian, Gregory Nazianzen, and Ambrose, 304

—point of difference between him and Calvin, 309.

B.

Baptism, Alexander Knox's views respecting sin after Baptism, 19.

Barbarians, incursion of, effects of Christianity upon it, 431, 434.

Barbeyrac, commends Whitby's work on the authority of the Fathers, 39—character of his work "De la Morale des Pères," 39, 40—his erroneous interpretation of a sentence of Lactantius, 41.

Barrow (Dr. Isaac), observations of, on "the Communion of Saints," 134.

Benson (Rev. C.), Letter to the Bishop of Lincoln respecting the proceedings of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, 511-513.

Bible, importance of the study of, 399.

Bishops, necessity of increasing their number, 464-467.

Blunt (Rev. J. J.), observations on the necessity of a religious education, 369, 370.

Brougham (Lord), his plan of National Education, 366.

Buddhism, its pure and lofty morality, 437, 438.

Bull (Bishop), defended by Nelson from the charge of countenancing Romish doctrines, 139.

Butler (Bishop), his "Analogy" and Sermons, objects pursued by him in them, 377, 378—his admirable sermon "on the Love of God," 395.

Q Q

Buxtorff, observations on the building of the Egyptian Pyramids, 401.

C.

Calvin, his disingenuous proceedings with reference to his statement of the opinions of the Fathers respecting the doctrine of Election, 306, 307—point of difference between him and Austin, 309.
Calvinistic notion of election, refutation of, 300.
Canterbury (Archbishop of), extract from his primary charge, 195, 196.
Chapter of, memorial respecting the proceedings of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, 477—481.
Cathedrals, threatened destruction of, its effect, 183, 184—duty of preserving them, 195-197, 561—guilt of subverting them, 198, 199.
Catholic Church. Scriptural character of it, 267.
Cause, the notion of, derived from experience, 388.
Central Education Society, its proceedings, 353-357—prejudice against the Church, 361.
Chalmers (Dr.), animadversions on his style, 105.
Charges by the Bishops of Durham, Winchester, and Lincoln, 1837, remarks on, 174.
Charity inconsistent with religious indifference, 29—character of modern charity, 186, 187—the nature of Christian charity, 200, 201.
Charles the Martyr, continuation of the service for, 543, *note*.
Children, number of, now receiving instruction in England and Wales, 344-347.
Church of England, advocates and acts on principles of toleration, 75—the most tolerant Church in the world, 76—effects of the recent combinations against it, 178-183.
Christian ministry, popular mistakes concerning the nature of their functions, 108, 109.
Christianity, its beneficent influence, 431-434—its effects upon the fine arts, 432—contrasted with Judaism, 433, 434.
Churches, duty of erecting additional ones, 195.
Church-rates, groundless objections to them, 60—petitions against them signed by many who were not dissenters, *ib.*—effects of the combination against

them, 183—proceedings of ministers of the crown with reference to them, 526.
Church-principle, its chief features, 394.
Church-accommodation, deplorable want of it in the metropolis, 188.
Church-discipline, observations on, 214, 215.
Clergy, their obligations to stir up their hearers to deeds of charity, 192, 193.
Commendams, proceedings of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners with reference to, 494, 495.
"Communion of Saints," observations on, by Barrow and Pearson, 134—errors of the Romanists respecting the doctrine, 134, 135.
Congregational system, its novelty, 49.
Conscience, its nature and office, 106.
Conservatism, viewed in connexion with the religious activity of the day, 189.
Controversy, religious, its evil tendency, 21—mode of deciding controversy, 26.
Corporation and Test Acts, repeal of, effect of it, 183.
Cranmer, prepares the Articles, 312—advised by Melancthon, 314.
Cromwell (Oliver), his policy with reference to the Presbyterians, 72, 73—his appointment of the "Triers," 73—numerous sects during the protectorship, *ib.*—his character, 74.
Cross of Christ, doctrine of, its important place in the Protestant system of theology, 2.
Culdees, origin and meaning of the term, 151—the Culdees of Iona, *ib.*

D.

Daille, object of his work on the authority of the Fathers, 31-33—his opinion respecting the use made by the English reformers of the writings of the Fathers, 32—his unfounded charge against Clement, 37—his remarks on Ignatius severely animadverted upon by Bishop Pearson, 38, *note*.
Daniel, book of, importance of the historical information contained in it, 400.
Davy (Sir Humphrey), his observation on sincerity in religion, 29.
Dissenters, their too ready credence of confident assertion, 50—their recent hostility to the Established Church, 59—origin and tendency of it, 60—their groundless objections to church-rates, *ib.*—and to the general character of the clergy, 61—secular views of many dissenting ministers, *ib.*—incon-

sistency of their notions and practices concerning subscriptions to articles of faith, 62—and concerning the discipline of the Church, 63—their principles different from those of the non-conformists, 79, 80.

Dodrell (H.), his canon of interpretation of the Epistles of St. Paul, 300.

Durham (Bishop of), charge in 1837, observations on, 174.

———, diocese of, recommendations of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners with reference to, 552, 553.

E.

East, the, its character distinguished from that of the *West*, 438.

Ecclesiastical Commission, the First, remark on its proceedings, 174, 175, 456—the Second, 457—First Report, 460-468—mistakes made by the commission, 466—the New Commission, 470—Third Report, 497—Fourth Report, 504—constitution given to the commission, 519.

Edwards (Jonathan), examination of his theory of the freedom of the will, 325.

Egypt, Syria, and Arabia, probability of their forming a new empire, 408, *note*.

Egyptian antiquities, light thrown on them by the researches and observations of modern travellers, 397.

Election, the primitive doctrine of, 299-311—theory of Locke, Whitby, and Taylor, 301—the moving cause in the Divine mind, 312—view of the Seventeenth Article, 313—opinion of the Anglican Church, 318—objection to the Calvinistic hypothesis, 325-328.

Education (national), observations on the modern schemes for effecting it, 329-365—opinions of Lord Brougham, 330—his bill, 332—futility of a compulsory system, 333-335—expense of it, 333, 334—conduct of the government, 335—progress of education in England from the earliest times, 338—moral effect produced, 348-350—necessity of religious knowledge, 368, 369—methods of improving education, 371-375.

England, an impartial history of ecclesiastical affairs in, from the reformation, a desideratum, 48.

Education for the middle ranks, importance of making provision for it, 459-454.

Ephesian Diana, signification of the crab upon the breast of, 428, *note*.

Episcopal Bench, present want of unity in, 174.

Erastian theory, not countenanced by the articles or formularies of our Church, 55.

Erskine (Thomas), Esq. treatise on the doctrine of election, 299-320—admission of a change of opinion, 321—character of his publication, 323—his just observations on Edward's theory of free-will, 325-327.

Established Church, the necessity of, insisted on by the non-conformists in 1662, 61.

Ethical fiction, utility of it, 88—rules for it, 89-103.

Etruscan tombs in the Campagna of Rome, 398.

Evangelicals, so called, their tenets contrasted with those of Alexander Knox, 12-16—his opinion respecting them, 16—misconceptions arising from the use of the term, 17—sense in which it was understood by Knox, *ib.*—his notion of Evangelical preaching, *ib.*—general remarks on their tenets and conduct, 85, 86.

Exeter (Bishop of), his objection to the composition of the Ecclesiastical Commission, 521—and to their proceedings with reference to the Episcopal office, 525.

Extempore preaching, enjoined by authority, in the reign of Charles II. 96.

F.

Faber (Rev. G. S.), his inquiry into the opinions of the primitive Church respecting the doctrine of election, 299—his examinations of the notions and arguments of Augustine, 305—the phrase "ecclesiastical individualism," 311—points established by him in this treatise, 318-320.

Fathers, use of their writings, 24—study of them important in the present day, 25-47—unjustly depreciated, *ib.*—object of Daillé's work respecting their writings, 31-33—neglected by the continental reformers, 38—studied by Hammond, Pearson, Bull, and Waterland, 39—their authority questioned by Whitby, *ib.*—and by Barbeyrac, *ib.*—their condemnation of usurious practices accounted for, 42—a revival of a reverence for their writings in the pre-

sent day, 43—our obligations to them, 47.

Founders of ecclesiastical establishments, their designs with reference to them, 480.

French works of imagination, modern, censured, 101.

*Froude (Rev. R. H.), remains, 200—contents of the volume, *ib.*—its character, 204—character of the subject of it, 205-213—extracts from his letters, 206—and from his journal, 208-211—poetry, 212—wants in the English Church, felt by him, 221.*

G.

Genesis, the account of the creation there given, confirmed by the researches of science, 399.

Gibson (Dr.), remarks on spiritual impropiators, 534.

Glasgow Model School, excellent suggestions made in the third report of, 373-375.

Gospel, its design, 17.

Gospel covenant, its nature, 313.

Greek Church, opinion of, respecting Transubstantiation, 230, 231.

H.

Hallam (Mr.), his just censure of the proceedings of the Long Parliament, 64.

Hearing Age, the, contrasted with the Reading Age, 283.

Hebrews, their commerce, 400—bread not publicly sold by them, 415.

Henry VIII., his alleged scruples, and divorce considered, 52.

Herodotus, his account of the Pyramids, 401.

"Home and Colonial Infant School Society," character of its proceedings, 341.

Hooker (Richard), dying words of, 20.

Hooper (Bishop of Gloucester), his scruples, 53, 54.

Hume (David), his notions of the effects of education, 356.

I.

Idea, definition of the term, 379.

Impropriations, proceedings of the Ecclesiastical Commission with respect to them, 463—three classes of, after the reformation, 533.

*Independents, their conduct before and subsequently to the death of Charles I. 72—their conduct with reference to that event, *ib.*—their intolerant proceedings, 75.*

Indifference, religious, inconsistent with charity, 29.

Indifferent actions, few such, with reference to the Church, 389.

Intercourse with the invisible world, reflections respecting it, 216-220.

Intermediate schools, importance of establishing them, 439-454.

Intermediate state of the soul, opinions respecting, 37.

Iona, the Abbot and Culdees of, their tenets respecting ecclesiastical government, 151, 152—their proceedings with regard to Oswald, King of Northumberland, 152, 153.

Ireland, English and Scotch settlers there in the reign of James I., 165, 166.

*Irish, the ancient, conjectures respecting the religion professed by, 149—held the divine origin of diocesan episcopacy, 156—believed in purgatory, *ib.*—practised private confession, *ib.*—extracts from Moore's History of Ireland, respecting the opinions and practices of the Irish ecclesiastics, 157—proceedings of Adrian IV. in the reign of Henry II., 158—effect of the conquest by that monarch, 160-162—slow progress of the Reformation during the reign of Henry VIII.—ill-judged proceedings of Elizabeth, 163-164—advice of Lord Bacon and Spencer, 164-167.*

J.

Jerusalem, present condition of, 413.

Jews of the middle age, history of them, 396—their dispersion, 417.

Jortin, his flippant remarks on the early history of the Church, spirit in which they originated, 182.

Julius (Dr. N. H.), his opinions respecting national education, 333.

Justification, its nature, 3-18, 120, 121.

K.

*Knor (Alexander), remains, his peculiar theological opinions, 2—his exposition of the doctrine of justification, *ib.* 3—supposed change in his views towards the close of his life, 4—this opinion examined, 6—his religious opinions*

affected by his constitutional temperament, 7, 8—nature of his religious depression, 8, 9—testimony of the Rev. S. O'Sullivan, 10—character of Mr. Kelly (Mr. Knox's friend), 11—his creed contrasted with that of the Evangelical School, 12, 13—possibility of their coalescing, 13, 14—his temper contrasted with theirs, 14—his opinion respecting their doctrinal scheme, 15, 16—and respecting their preaching, 17—complexion of his theology, 18—his views of the effects of our Saviour's merits, *ib.*—identifies remission of sin with deliverance from its bondage, 19—dangerous tendency of his doctrine respecting the merits of the Saviour, 20—his frequent appeals to the liturgy, *ib.*

L.

Leud (Archbishop), his character, 57.
Liberality, true Christian, 235, 236.
Lincoln (Bishop of), charge to his clergy in 1837, observations on, 174—his objections to the revival of the convocation, 177.
Liturgy of the Church of England, its perfect consistency, 21, 22.
Locke (Mr.), his definition of the word "idea," 379.
London (Bishop of), extract from his speech in the House of Lords in commendation of the National Schools, 351—and from a sermon preached by his Lordship on behalf of the Society, 375—remarks on the establishment of "Intermediate Schools," 454.
Louis XIV., impolicy of his persecution of the French Protestants, 435, *note*.

M.

Manning (Rev. H. E.), his examination of the principle of the Ecclesiastical Commission, 461.
Melville (Rev. H.), observations on his style, 104, *note*—observations on the necessity of a religious education, 356, 357.
Methodism, modern, contrasted with dissent, 282—dangerous notions prevalent among them respecting the divine nature of the Saviour, 566.
Metropolis Churches' Fund, observations on its magnitude, the spirit by which it has been raised, and the indications that may be drawn from it, 179-181,

184—wisdom and duty of increasing it, 185—proceedings with reference to the disposal of it, 193.
Middle Schools, importance of establishing them, 439—454.
Milner, examination of his claim of the suffrages of Clemens, Romanus, and Ignatius, in favour of the doctrine of election, 307.
Modern art, its productions contrasted with those of pagan art, 433, *note*.
Moral Philosophy, great discoveries in, not to be expected, 376—mode and importance of the study, 390.
Mosheim, a remark of his on pious frauds practised in the fourth century with reference to the writings of the Fathers, 34.
"Mother of God," origin and import of the expression, as applied to the blessed Virgin, 135.
Music, sacred, its effects, 432.

N.

Name, the ascription of a wrong one not always fatal to the value of a treatise, 33.
"National School Society," its proceedings and inquiries, 343—testimonies in its favour, 351—central school, nature and amount of the instruction given in it, 352—refutation of an attack upon the school in Baldwin's Gardens, 363.
Natural History, its dependence on cosmography and anthropology, 399.
Neal's History of the Puritans, censured, 48.
Nelson's "Festivals and Fasts," animadverted on by the Essex memorialists, 123-137—remonstrance against a mutilation of passages in his book, 136.
Nile, overflowing of the, 428, *note*.
Nineteenth century, marks by which it seems distinguished, 180, 181.
Non-conformists, their conduct with respect to the Act of Uniformity, 78, 79—their principles different from those of the Dissenters, 79, 80.
Non-resistance, the principle enforced, 140-148.
Nyseean horses, the province of Khorassan, the native country of, 421.

O.

Ophir, its locality, 407, 410, *note*, 411.
Orme (Rev. William), *Memoirs of Owen*, 48—his defence of the antiquity of the

system of Independency, 50—his life of Owen censured, 51-58—his unfair remarks on Archbishop Laud, 57, 58—and on the discipline of the Church, 63—and on the origin and character of the civil war, 64—his undeserved commendation of the proceedings of the Long Parliament, 65—his inconsistent remarks on the death of Charles I., 72—defends the Independents from the charge of intolerance, 75—remarks on the Act of Uniformity, 77—erroneously identifies the principles of the Dissenters with those of the Non-conformists, 79—his attack upon Hooker and Stillingfleet, 80, 81—his inconsistency, 82.

Osburn (William), of Leeds, "Doctrinal errors of the Apostolical and early Fathers," 44—instances of his mistranslation, *ib.*

Owen (Dr. John), specimen of his enthusiastic style of writing, 74—his inconsistency of conduct with respect to toleration, 75.

P.

Pashley (R.), Esq., Travels in Crete, 225—the writer's qualifications, *ib.*—condition and prospects of the inhabitants of Crete, 216—war between the Greeks and Turks, 227—instances of pedantry in the author, 227—character of his book, 228—his mistakes respecting the Mozarabic Liturgy, 229—and respecting the religion of Greece, 238—the profaneuess of his theory respecting religious opinions in the East and West, 239—his own exposition of his theory, 240—extracts illustrative of his opinion and feelings with reference to religious observances, 242-246—reprehensible character of his work, 246.

Patronage, proceedings of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners with reference to, 490-492.

Peel (Sir Robert), mistake made by him with reference to ecclesiastical matters, 469.

Persecution, religious, consistent with indifference to the prevalent religion, 29.

Personal rights of societies, remarks on them, 387.

Phœnician colonies, account of them, 420—their manufactures, 422—the Phœnician people, 423—cause of their decline, *ib.*

Plato, his moral philosophy contrasted with that of Aristotle, 392, 428, 429.

Plurality Bill, its tendency, 524.

Poor Law, new, effects of it, beneficial and mischievous, 183.

Prayer more important than preaching, 294.

Prayers of saints departed, 133, 134.

Preaching, a proper style of, 104, *note*—vehement preaching, in what circumstances beneficial, 169—less important than prayer, 294.

Predestination, the doctrine of, 299-328.

Presbyterianism, its recent origin, 149.

Presbyterians, their conduct before and subsequently to the death of Charles I., 72—their conduct compared with that of the Independents on that occasion, *ib.*—Cromwell's policy with reference to them, 73—conduct of the Presbyterian divines who settled in Ireland in the reign of James I., 169-171—proceedings of the Earl of Strafford, 171—the Presbyterians under Cromwell, 172—their present condition, *ib.*

Presbyterian Church in Ireland, its history by Dr. Reid, 149—its origin, 163.

Primitive Church, opinions of, importance of an intimate acquaintance with them, 290.

Puritans, conduct and treatment of them in the reign of Elizabeth, 55, 56.

Pusey, (Rev. E. B.), D. D., his sermon preached on the 5th of November, 1837, commended, 140-148—extract from it, 143.

Pyramids, origin and design of them, 401.

R.

Radical Speeches, in the House of Commons, with reference to the revenues of the Church, 509, *note*.

Reading and Hearing Ages, the, contrasted, 283.

Rebellion, its sinfulness, 147.

Reformation, the, its nature and effects, 27-51—little progress made by it in Ireland in the reign of Henry VIII., 162.

Reformers, English, their religious principles, 27, 28—established no progressive principle in religion, 28—did not idolize private judgment, *ib.*—their well-regulated deference to antiquity, 29, 30—and judicious use of the writings of the Fathers, 47.

Registration Acts, new, effects of them, 183.

Reid (Dr.), History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, 149—character of the work, 173.
Religious controversy, its rise and mischievous tendency, 21.
Religious persecution, consistent with indifference to the prevalent religion, 29.
Religious "Revivals," observations on, 168, 169, 294.
Revelation, Book of, commentary upon, 563.
Revolution, the, of 1688, nature of the era which it constitutes, 181.
Ridley, appeals to the Fathers as witnesses, not as authorities, 30.
Rae (Rev. H. J.), remarks of, on the proceedings of the Ecclesiastical Commission, 459.
Russell (Michael), D. D., Connection of Sacred and Profane History, merits of the work, 436.

S.

Sacrilege, its guilt and danger, 198, 199, 532.
Sanctification, doctrine of, modern notions respecting it, 4—its nature, 18—its progressive tendency, 18, 19.
Scriptures, importance of the study of, 399.
Short (Rev. Thomas Vowler), his character of Henry VIII., 52—his observations on the alienation of monastic property, *ib.*—his opinions respecting Cranmer's views on the question of Church government, 54—his erroneous representations respecting the conduct and treatment of the Puritans, 55—his remarks on the treatment of the ejected ministers at the Restoration, 76—his scheme for the establishment of *Intermediate Schools*, 454.
Simon, on the building of the pyramids, 401.
Sin after Baptism, Alexander Knox's views respecting it, 19.
Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, observations on two memorials addressed to the general meeting, respecting some of its publications, 113-118—unfounded charges of the memorialists against "Nelson's Festivals and Fasts," and the "Whole Duty of Man," 123.
Societies, their personal rights, 387.
Sodor and Man, suppression of the bishopric of, 470.

Soul, opinions respecting its intermediate state, 37.
Sphinx, signification of the, 428, *note*.
Spitalfields, origin of the silk trade there, 435, *note*.
Spoilation of the Church, its guilt and danger, 552.
Stillington's Irenicum, its object and character, 81-84—his sermon on the "Mischiefs of Separation," *ib.*—"The Unreasonableness of Separation," 81, 82.
Styrie, his writings commended, 48.
Sufferings of the ejected ministers, 65-68—Walker's account of them, 71.
Sunday-schools, their origin and effects, 339.
Supernatural Things, general craving after them, 216, 217.
Syria, its delightful climate, and rich and varied productions, 425.

T.

Tabernacle of Moses, contributions for the building of it, a type for the variety of Christian service, 554.
Tarshish, its locality, 407.
Taylor, (Jeremy), on the persecutions of the early Christians, 239, 240.
Θεοράς, origin and import of the term, 135.
Tillotson (Archbishop), his "Rule of Faith," 39—his project for a new Book of Homilies, 115—Bishop Burnet's account of it, 116—Bishop Jebb's opinion of parts of the performance, 118—his questionable observations on the doctrine of justification, 119-121.
Toleration, principles of, advocated and acted on by the Church of England, 75.
Transubstantiation, whether held by the Greek church? 230.
Travellers, English, conduct to be pursued by them in foreign countries, with respect to religious observances, 236, 237.
Trollope (Mrs.), attacks the evangelicals in her "Vicar of Wrexhill," 86—reprehensible character of her publication, 87.
Truths which especially concern Christians, 310.

U.

Utilitarianism, nature of the system, 377, 391.

V.

Voltaire, the encomiast of Julian, 434, note.

Voluntary system, its novelty and folly, 59
—voluntary principle, in regard to education, remarks on it, 341, 342.

W.

Walker's account of the sufferings of the sequestered clergy, 71-79.

Warburton (Bishop), his observations on the deference paid by the English Reformers to the authority of the Fathers, 30—his mistakes on this point, *ib.*

Whewell (Rev. W.), principle assumed by him as the basis of a system of ethics, 387.

Whitby, impeaches the authority of the Fathers, 39.

Whitefield (Rev. George), life, by Robert Philip, 265—his birth, 268—anecdote of his early life, 269—his education, *ib.*—change in his religious views, *ib.*—entered at Pembroke College, Oxford, 270—is ordained, 272—receives and accepts an invitation from John Wesley to visit America, 273—remarkable effects of his farewell sermons, *ib.*—account of his voyage to America, 275—returns to England, 276—rejects the overtures made to him by the Associate Presbytery, and is admitted into the pulpits of the Kirk, 278—his notions

of fidelity to the Church, 279—prodigious effect of his preaching, 280, 281—his rhetorical qualifications, 283, 284—anecdote of Franklin, illustrative of his powers of persuasion, 284—his repeated delivery of the same sermon, 286—his singular courtship, 287—affecting narrative of the death of his infant child, 290—his insensibility to the wickedness of slavery, 291—his characteristics, 293—specimens of his pulpit oratory, 295, 296—anecdotes respecting him, 297, 298.

White's Centurie, analysis of it, 66-72.

"*Whole Duty of Man*," censured by the Essex memorialists, 123, 137—the work commended, *ib.*

Wilberforce (Mr.), his remarks on the Act of Uniformity, and on the character of Baxter, 78.

Winchester (Bishop of), charge to his clergy, observations on, 174—extracts from it, condemnatory of the Ecclesiastical Commission, 175-177.

"*Work out your own salvation*," &c., Philip. ii. 13, 13, commentary on these words, 107.

Works of fiction, their utility, 88, 89, 105—modern, censured, 101.

Y.

York, diocese of, recommendation of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, with reference to, 544, 546.

L O N D O N :

C. ROWORTH AND SONS, BELI. YARD,
TEMPLE BAR.

THE
BRITISH CRITIC,
AND
QUARTERLY
THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

VOLUME XXIV.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR J. G. & F. RIVINGTON,
ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD, AND WATERLOO-PLACE, PALL-MALL;
AND
SOLD BY BELL AND BRADFUTE, EDINBURGH; AND
MILLIKEN, DUBLIN.

1838.

stood as so applied in Genesis also); then, must we infer, that the words 'tree of the knowledge of good and evil' are used figuratively also, to express some representation of that 'knowledge,' which was fatal to the attainment of eternal life, of that 'knowledge,' the possession of which involved the loss, or the non-attainment, of that eternal life which was purchased by the sacrifice of Christ; and, that the word 'eat,' as applied to that 'tree of knowledge,' is also figuratively used, to express the acquisition, or reception, of that 'knowledge.'"—p. 63. A very *rational* way of interpreting Scripture certainly—and for every species of fanaticism or heresy, very convenient.

Isle of Man and Diocese of Sodor and Man. Ancient and authentic Records and Documents relating to the Civil and Ecclesiastical History of that Island. Collected and arranged by the Rev. William Percival Ward, M.A., Domestic Chaplain to the Bishop of Sodor and Man. Rivingtons. 1837. 8vo. pp. 186:

THIS little work does not require our recommendation, for, under present circumstances, the subject is enough to secure attention to every publication which relates to it. We must, however, thank Mr. Ward, not only for having collected so many interesting and valuable documents, and so much historical information, but for having given them to us in so pleasing, and, at the same time, so cheap a form.

The Lord Bishop of Ripon's Cobwebs to catch Calvinists; being a few Remarks on his Lordship's Questions to Candidates, at his late Ordination at Ripon. By a Clergyman of the Diocese. Simpkin and Marshall. 1838. 8vo. pp. 23.

WE have told our readers all that we know of this pamphlet by the mere act of giving them the title-page, which appeared to us so disgusting, that we did not look further into it. We presume, that the writer is some aggrieved Calvinist, who has been caught; but whether this is the case—or whether it is a gratuitous effusion of party—the writer ought to know, that the mere office of a bishop entitles him to be treated as a gentleman, even by those who are not gentlemen themselves. We say nothing, for we really know nothing, about the circumstances which have given rise to the pamphlet, and we are in no wise engaged to defend the conduct of the Bishop of Ripon, or any other bishop, in this, or in any other matter; but, be the bishop's conduct what it may, it cannot authorize any of his inferior clergy to show him up to the public, under the figure of a loathsome and despicable creeping thing, employed in spreading snares for the destruction of his brethren. Such humour should be confined to Sunday newspapers, and the other popular organs of a Mar-prelate age; and if ever it is taken up by the clergy, it ought to be met with unqualified disgust, and received as an avowal, that the cause in which it is employed is identified with the lowest radicalism. We do not know whether the title-page (for we are speaking of that only) is more or less discreditable for being anonymous.

INDEX

OF THE

REMARKABLE PASSAGES

IN THE

CRITICISMS, EXTRACTS, AND ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

A.

Act of Uniformity, observations on it, 76, 77.

Additional Curates' Fund, remarks upon its magnitude, and upon the spirit by which it has been raised, 184—nature of the purpose to which it is to be applied, 194.

Anderson (Rev. J. S.), sermons—their excellence, 103—extracts, 110-112.

Anquetil, on the building of the Egyptian Pyramids, 401.

Antiquity, deference due to it, 26-29.

Arabia, Syria, and Egypt, probability of their forming a new empire, 408, *note*.

Aristotle, admirable observation of his, 386—his moral philosophy contrasted with that of Plato, 392—element on which it was founded, 393, 428, 429.

Arminianism, derives no countenance from Scripture, 311.

Articles of the Church of England, their design misrepresented by Paley, 54—date of their first publication, 312—view of the Seventeenth Article, 313-315, 317.

Athanasian Creed, observations on its origin, 33, *note*.

Austin (St.), remarks of, on the observance of different customs in different Churches, 234, 235—charged with innovation by his contemporaries, with reference to his views of Election and Predestination, 302—examination of his claim to the suffrages of Cyprian, Gregory Nazianzen, and Ambrose, 304

VOL. XXIII.

—point of difference between him and Calvin, 309.

B.

Baptism, Alexander Knox's views respecting sin after Baptism, 19.

Barbarians, incursion of, effects of Christianity upon it, 431, 434.

Barbeyrac, commends Whitby's work on the authority of the Fathers, 39—character of his work "De la Morale des Pères," 39, 40—his erroneous interpretation of a sentence of Lactantius, 41.

Barrow (Dr. Isaac), observations of, on "the Communion of Saints," 134.

Benson (Rev. C.), Letter to the Bishop of Lincoln respecting the proceedings of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, 511-513.

Bible, importance of the study of, 399.

Bishops, necessity of increasing their number, 464-467.

Blunt (Rev. J. J.), observations on the necessity of a religious education, 369, 370.

Brougham (Lord), his plan of National Education, 366.

Buddhism, its pure and lofty morality, 437, 438.

Bull (Bishop), defended by Nelson from the charge of countenancing Romish doctrines, 139.

Butler (Bishop), his "Analogy" and Sermons, objects pursued by him in them, 377, 378—his admirable sermon "on the Love of God," 395.

Q Q

Buxtorff, observations on the building of the Egyptian Pyramids, 401.

C.

Calvin, his disingenuous proceedings with reference to his statement of the opinions of the Fathers respecting the doctrine of Election, 306, 307—point of difference between him and Austin, 309.
Calvinistic notion of election, refutation of, 300.

Canterbury (Archbishop of), extract from his primary charge, 195, 196.

Chapter of, memorial respecting the proceedings of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, 477—481.

Cathedrals, threatened destruction of, its effect, 183, 184—duty of preserving them, 195-197, 561—guilt of subverting them, 198, 199.

Catholic Church. Scriptural character of it, 267.

Cause, the notion of, derived from experience, 388.

Central Education Society, its proceedings, 353-357—prejudice against the Church, 361.

Chalmers (Dr.), animadversions on his style, 105.

Charges by the Bishops of Durham, Winchester, and Lincoln, 1837, remarks on, 174.

Charity inconsistent with religious indifference, 29—character of modern charity, 186, 187—the nature of Christian charity, 200, 201.

Charles the Martyr, continuation of the service for, 543, *note*.

Children, number of, now receiving instruction in England and Wales, 344-347.

Church of England, advocates and acts on principles of toleration, 75—the most tolerant Church in the world, 76—effects of the recent combinations against it, 178-183.

Christian ministry, popular mistakes concerning the nature of their functions, 108, 109.

Christianity, its beneficent influence, 431-434—its effects upon the fine arts, 432—contrasted with Judaism, 433, 434.

Churches, duty of erecting additional ones, 195.

Church-rates, groundless objections to them, 60—petitions against them signed by many who were not dissenters, *ib.*—effects of the combination against

them, 183—proceedings of ministers of the crown with reference to them, 526.

Church-principle, its chief features, 394.

Church-accommodation, deplorable want of it in the metropolis, 188.

Church-discipline, observations on, 214, 215.

Clergy, their obligations to stir up their hearers to deeds of charity, 192, 193.

Commendams, proceedings of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners with reference to, 494, 495.

"*Communion of Saints*," observations on, by Barrow and Pearson, 134—errors of the Romanists respecting the doctrine, 134, 135.

Congregational system, its novelty, 49.

Conscience, its nature and office, 106.

Conservatism, viewed in connexion with the religious activity of the day, 189.

Controversy, religious, its evil tendency, 21—mode of deciding controversy, 26.

Corporation and Test Acts, repeal of, effect of it, 183.

Crammer, prepares the Articles, 312—advised by Melancthon, 314.

Cromwell (Oliver), his policy with reference to the Presbyterians, 72, 73—his appointment of the "Triers," 73—numerous sects during the protectorship, *ib.*—his character, 74.

Cross of Christ, doctrine of, its important place in the Protestant system of theology, 2.

Culdees, origin and meaning of the term, 151—the Culdees of Iona, *ib.*

D.

Daille, object of his work on the authority of the Fathers, 31-33—his opinion respecting the use made by the English reformers of the writings of the Fathers, 32—his unfounded charge against Clement, 37—his remarks on Ignatius severely animadverted upon by Bishop Pearson, 38, *note*.

Daniel, book of, importance of the historical information contained in it, 400.

Davy (Sir Humphrey), his observation on sincerity in religion, 29.

Dissenters, their too ready credence of confident assertion, 50—their recent hostility to the Established Church, 59—origin and tendency of it, 60—their groundless objections to church-rates, *ib.*—and to the general character of the clergy, 61—secular views of many dissenting ministers, *ib.*—incon-

sistency of their notions and practices concerning subscriptions to articles of faith, 62—and concerning the discipline of the Church, 63—their principles different from those of the non-conformists, 79, 80.

Dodwell (H.), his canon of interpretation of the Epistles of St. Paul, 300.

Durham (Bishop of), charge in 1837, observations on, 174.

———, diocese of, recommendations of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners with reference to, 552, 553.

E.

East, the, its character distinguished from that of the *West*, 438.

Ecclesiastical Commission, the First, remark on its proceedings, 174, 175, 456—the Second, 457—First Report, 460-468—mistakes made by the commission, 466—the New Commission, 470—Third Report, 497—Fourth Report, 504—constitution given to the commission, 519.

Edwards (Jonathan), examination of his theory of the freedom of the will, 325.

Egypt, Syria, and Arabia, probability of their forming a new empire, 408, *note*.

Egyptian antiquities, light thrown on them by the researches and observations of modern travellers, 397.

Election, the primitive doctrine of, 299-311—theory of Locke, Whitby, and Taylor, 301—the moving cause in the Divine mind, 312—view of the Seventeenth Article, 313—opinion of the Anglican Church, 318—objection to the Calvinistic hypothesis, 325-328.

Education (national), observations on the modern schemes for effecting it, 329-365—opinions of Lord Brougham, 330—his bill, 332—futility of a compulsory system, 333-335—expense of it, 333, 334—conduct of the government, 335—progress of education in England from the earliest times, 338—moral effect produced, 348-350—necessity of religious knowledge, 368, 369—methods of improving education, 371-375.

England, an impartial history of ecclesiastical affairs in, from the reformation, a desideratum, 48.

Education for the middle ranks, importance of making provision for it, 459-454.

Ephesian Diana, signification of the crab upon the breast of, 428, *note*.

Episcopal Bench, present want of unity in, 174.

Erastian theory, not countenanced by the articles or formularies of our Church, 55.

Erskine (Thomas), Esq. treatise on the doctrine of election, 299-320—admission of a change of opinion, 321—character of his publication, 323—his just observations on Edward's theory of free-will, 325-327.

Established Church, the necessity of, insisted on by the non-conformists in 1662, 61.

Ethical fiction, utility of it, 88—rules for it, 89-103.

Etruscan tombs in the Campagna of Rome, 398.

Evangelicals, so called, their tenets contrasted with those of Alexander Knox, 12-16—his opinion respecting them, 16—misconceptions arising from the use of the term, 17—sense in which it was understood by Knox, *ib.*—his notion of Evangelical preaching, *ib.*—general remarks on their tenets and conduct, 85, 86.

Exeter (Bishop of), his objection to the composition of the Ecclesiastical Commission, 521—and to their proceedings with reference to the Episcopal office, 525.

Extempore preaching, enjoined by authority, in the reign of Charles II. 96.

F.

Faber (Rev. G. S.), his inquiry into the opinions of the primitive Church respecting the doctrine of election, 299—his examinations of the notions and arguments of Augustine, 305—the phrase "ecclesiastical individualism," 311—points established by him in this treatise, 318-320.

Fathers, use of their writings, 24—study of them important in the present day, 25-47—unjustly depreciated, *ib.*—object of Daillé's work respecting their writings, 31-33—neglected by the continental reformers, 38—studied by Hammond, Pearson, Bull, and Waterland, 39—their authority questioned by Whitby, *ib.*—and by Barbeyrac, *ib.*—their condemnation of usurious practices accounted for, 42—a revival of a reverence for their writings in the pre-

sent day, 43—our obligations to them, 47.

Founders of ecclesiastical establishments, their designs with reference to them, 480.

French works of imagination, modern, censured, 101.

Froude (Rev. R. H.), remains, 200—contents of the volume, *ib.*—its character, 204—character of the subject of it, 205-213—extracts from his letters, 206—and from his journal, 208-211—poetry, 212—wants in the English Church, felt by him, 221.

G.

Genesis, the account of the creation there given, confirmed by the researches of science, 399.

Gibson (Dr.), remarks on spiritual impropiators, 534.

Glasgow Model School, excellent suggestions made in the third report of, 373-375.

Gospel, its design, 17.

Gospel covenant, its nature, 313.

Greek Church, opinion of, respecting Transubstantiation, 230, 231.

H.

Hallam (Mr.), his just censure of the proceedings of the Long Parliament, 64.

Hearing Age, the, contrasted with the Reading Age, 283.

Hebrews, their commerce, 400—bread not publicly sold by them, 415.

Henry VIII., his alleged scruples, and divorce considered, 52.

Herodotus, his account of the Pyramids, 401.

"*Home and Colonial Infant School Society*," character of its proceedings, 341.

Hooker (Richard), dying words of, 20.

Hooper (Bishop of Gloucester), his scruples, 53, 54.

Hume (David), his notions of the effects of education, 356.

I.

Idea, definition of the term, 379.

Impropriations, proceedings of the Ecclesiastical Commission with respect to them, 463—three classes of, after the reformation, 533.

Independents, their conduct before and subsequently to the death of Charles I. 72—their conduct with reference to that event, *ib.*—their intolerant proceedings, 75.

Indifference, religious, inconsistent with charity, 29.

Indifferent actions, few such, with reference to the Church, 389.

Intercourses with the invisible world, reflections respecting it, 216-220.

Intermediate schools, importance of establishing them, 439-454.

Intermediate state of the soul, opinions respecting, 37.

Iona, the Abbot and Culdees of, their tenets respecting ecclesiastical government, 151, 152—their proceedings with regard to Oswald, King of Northumberland, 152, 153.

Ireland, English and Scotch settlers there in the reign of James I., 165, 166.

Irish, the ancient, conjectures respecting the religion professed by, 149—held the divine origin of diocesan episcopacy, 156—believed in purgatory, *ib.*—practised private confession, *ib.*—extracts from Moore's History of Ireland, respecting the opinions and practices of the Irish ecclesiastics, 157—proceedings of Adrian IV. in the reign of Henry II., 158—effect of the conquest by that monarch, 160-162—slow progress of the Reformation during the reign of Henry VIII.—ill-judged proceedings of Elizabeth, 163-164—advice of Lord Bacon and Spencer, 164-167.

J.

Jerusalem, present condition of, 413.

Jews of the middle age, history of them, 396—their dispersion, 417.

Jortin, his flippant remarks on the early history of the Church, spirit in which they originated, 182.

Julius (Dr. N. H.), his opinions respecting national education, 333.

Justification, its nature, 3-18, 120, 121.

K.

Knox (Alexander), remains, his peculiar theological opinions, 2—his exposition of the doctrine of justification, *ib.* 3—supposed change in his views towards the close of his life, 4—this opinion examined, 6—his religious opinions

affected by his constitutional temperament, 7, 8—nature of his religious depression, 8, 9—testimony of the Rev. S. O'Sullivan, 10—character of Mr. Kelly (Mr. Knox's friend), 11—his creed contrasted with that of the Evangelical School, 12, 13—possibility of their coalescing, 13, 14—his temper contrasted with theirs, 14—his opinion respecting their doctrinal scheme, 15, 16—and respecting their preaching, 17—complexion of his theology, 18—his views of the effects of our Saviour's merits, *ib.*—identifies remission of sin with deliverance from its bondage, 19—dangerous tendency of his doctrine respecting the merits of the Saviour, 20—his frequent appeals to the liturgy, *ib.*

L.

Laud (Archbishop), his character, 57.
Liberality, true Christian, 235, 236.
Lincoln (Bishop of), charge to his clergy in 1837, observations on, 174—his objections to the revival of the convocation, 177.
Liturgy of the Church of England, its perfect consistency, 21, 22.
Locke (Mr.), his definition of the word "idea," 379.
London (Bishop of), extract from his speech in the House of Lords in commendation of the National Schools, 351—and from a sermon preached by his Lordship on behalf of the Society, 375—remarks on the establishment of "Intermediate Schools," 454.
Louis XIV., impolicy of his persecution of the French Protestants, 435, *note*.

M.

Manning (Rev. H. E.), his examination of the principle of the Ecclesiastical Commission, 461.
Melville (Rev. H.), observations on his style, 104, *note*—observations on the necessity of a religious education, 356, 357.
Methodism, modern, contrasted with dissent, 282—dangerous notions prevalent among them respecting the divine nature of the Saviour, 566.
Metropolis Churches' Fund, observations on its magnitude, the spirit by which it has been raised, and the indications that may be drawn from it, 179-181,

184—wisdom and duty of increasing it, 185—proceedings with reference to the disposal of it, 193.

Middle Schools, importance of establishing them, 439—454.

Milner, examination of his claim of the suffrages of Clemens, Romanus, and Ignatius, in favour of the doctrine of election, 307.

Modern art, its productions contrasted with those of pagan art, 433, *note*.

Moral Philosophy, great discoveries in, not to be expected, 376—mode and importance of the study, 390.

Mosheim, a remark of his on pious frauds practised in the fourth century with reference to the writings of the Fathers, 34.

"*Mother of God*," origin and import of the expression, as applied to the blessed Virgin, 135.

Music, sacred, its effects, 432.

N.

Name, the ascription of a wrong one not always fatal to the value of a treatise, 33.

"*National School Society*," its proceedings and inquiries, 343—testimonies in its favour, 351—central school, nature and amount of the instruction given in it, 352—refutation of an attack upon the school in Baldwin's Gardens, 363.

Natural History, its dependence on cosmography and anthropology, 399.

Neal's History of the Puritans, censured, 48.

Nelson's "Festivals and Fasts", animadverted on by the Essex memorialists, 123-137—remonstrance against a mutilation of passages in his book, 136.

Nile, overflowing of the, 428, *note*.

Nineteenth century, marks by which it seems distinguished, 180, 181.

Non-conformists, their conduct with respect to the Act of Uniformity, 78, 79—their principles different from those of the Dissenters, 79, 80.

Non-resistance, the principle enforced, 140-148.

Nysean horses, the province of Khorassan, the native country of, 421.

O.

Ophir, its locality, 407, 410, *note*, 411.

Orme (Rev. William), *Memoirs of Owen*, 48—his defence of the antiquity of the

K.

Ken (Bishop), *The Prose Works of*, 167.

L.

"*Laud and Leighton*," a Sermon by the Rev. T. Mortimer, 488.

Lee (Edwin), *Animal Magnetism and Homœopathy*, 301.

Lockhart's Life and Writings of Sir Walter Scott, 423.

M.

Macray's Translations from the Lyric Poets of Germany, 489.

Mant (Bishop), *Sermons on the Church and her Ministrations*, 232.

Marriott (Rev. J.), *Sermons*, 487.

Martyn (Rev. H.), *Memoir of*, 120.

————— *Journals and Letters of, ib.*

Melvill (Rev. H.), *Sermons*, 232.

Memorials of Oxford. By James Ingram, D. D., 133.

M'Caul (Dr.), *Sketches of Judaism*, 484.

Milnes (Richard Monkton), *Memorials of a Residence on the Continent, and Historical Poems. Poems of Many Years*, 271.

N.

Newman (Rev. J. H.), *Lectures on Justification*, 82.

O.

Oxford (Bishop of), *Charge to his Clergy*, 487.

Oxford, *Memorials of*. By Dr. Ingram, 133.

P.

Palgrave (Sir Francis), *Truths and Fictions of the Middle Ages*, 372.

Palmer (Rev. W.), *A Treatise on the Church of Christ*, 347.

Parkinson's Hulsean Lectures, 485.

Parsons (Rev. Daniel), *Parochial Sermons*, 488.

Poole's Testimony of St. Cyprian against Rome, 233.

Pusey (Dr.), *Edition of the Original Text of St. Austin's Confessions*, 484.

R.

Random Recollections of Exeter Hall, 190.

Round (Rev. J. T.), *Edition of the Prose Works of Bishop Ken*, 167.

S.

Sargent (Rev. John), *Memoir of the Rev. H. Martyn*, 120.

Schleiermacher's Introduction to the Dialogues of Plato, 1.

Scott, Sir Walter, Bart., *Memoirs of the Life of*, 425.

Stow (David), Esq., *The Training System adopted in the Model Schools of the Glasgow Educational Society*, 211.

Strauss's Polemical Tracts, 490.

T.

The Stewart Missions, 400.

The Training System adopted in the Model Schools of the Glasgow Educational Society, 211.

Trench (Chenevix), *Poems*, 271.

V.

Van Heusde, Phil. Gul., *Initia Philosophiæ Platoniciæ*, 1.

W.

Wigram's "Schoolmaster's Manual", 236.

Wilberforce (William, Esq.), *The Life of*. By his Sons, 239.

Wilberforce (Mr.), *Essay on the Parochial System*, 489.

THE
BRITISH CRITIC,
AND
Quarterly Theological Review.

JULY, 1838.

- ART. I.—1. *Schleiermacher's Introduction to the Dialogues of Plato*. Translated from the German by William Dobson. 1836.
2. *Initia Philosophiæ Platoniciæ*. Auct. Phil. Gul. Van Heusde. 1827—31.

It has become a trite observation of thoughtful men, that in all around us in the present day there is a sound and a movement—a working in the human mind—a stirring in the waters which betokens the approach of some great change. Not only in this country, but throughout the civilized world, there are symptoms of a crisis in opinion as well as in society. The two cannot be separated. Old forms are breaking up, and new are thickening on each other. Wider scenes of action seem opened to practical minds, and deeper mines of thought for speculation. There is in the many an eager restless craving for some vague good, which all anticipate and none define; an exultation at coming prospects; a contempt for the poverty of the past, and the imperfection of the present; a sense of newly awakened powers; a passion for new sympathies and combinations; a general baring and exposure of the human mind, as among men who have cast off restraint and are about to enter together on some great enterprise. And when the current is not rushing forward with an accelerated movement, it is turning in an extraordinary way, and remounting back to its source. Those who think, and those who think not, all seem impressed with something of a mysterious action. And even the few who take no part in the crowd, are sitting with anxious eye watching for the end.

To a philosophical observer, the symptoms of this singular state of the human mind are full of interest; though they may appear in seemingly very insulated facts, and, when connected with the general principle, may sound far-fetched.

One of them is a remarkable phenomenon, which cannot have escaped the observer of general literature. Within the last few

years, simultaneously, and without any connection, a general tendency to revive the study of Plato has sprung up in the most intellectual parts of Europe, in Germany, France, and England. In Germany it is returning after a short suspension. In France appearing for the first time. In England recovering slowly, and perhaps never likely to assume a very prominent position, from circumstances, happy circumstances, which supersede its necessity. In Germany, one of its most eloquent advocates, Van Heusde,* has expressly stated the feelings under which he is anxious to restore it. He describes the weariness and disheartened apathy which has followed from the rapid succession of modern theories, each rising on the ruins of its predecessor, standing firm and domineering for a time, and then sinking suddenly into ruin. He seems to feel rather than to acknowledge, that the only security against this dangerous and miserable oscillation of sects and opinions, must be found in the predominance of authority; and he proposes to revive the study of Plato as the philosopher who concentrated most perfectly in his system the excellences of the schools that preceded him, and the sanction of those that have followed. In France, as might naturally be expected† from the state of that unhappy country, where depth of thought has been so rare, and philosophy is just beginning to run the career which in Germany it seems to have completed, the supposed sceptical and eclectic character of Platonism appears chiefly to have excited attention. And by a most remarkable mistake, not indeed uncommon, but which proves how little men have entered into the real spirit and object of Plato's writings, the name of a philosopher, whose whole efforts were systematically and energetically addressed to the establishment of an immutable belief in immutable truths external to man, and guaranteed by the authority of men, has been chosen as the index of a spirit which treats all former systems with contempt, and proposes to raise upon their ruins a new structure of belief based on that, which must overturn itself, the reason of an individual or a section.

In England the study of the Greek philosophy has been chiefly confined to the University of Oxford, which providentially has been saved from setting the seal of its sanction either to Paley or Locke; and has adhered firmly to Aristotle as the text-book in her plan of education. In addition to the soundness and depth of his views, the technical and systematic form of the ethics of Aristotle renders it far fitter for such a purpose than any extant work of any period; and no greater mischief could be done than to abandon it for any other less formal treatise, even for the nobler and more elevating philosophy of Plato himself. Within

* Init. Phil. Pl. vol. iii. ch. 1.

† See Cousin's Lectures.

the last few years, however, more attention has been gradually drawn to the writings of Plato. Unconsciously, and without recognizing fully the extraordinary affinity of his views to the principles which are once more forcing themselves into life, and struggling against the errors of this day, young men especially have been captivated by the grandeur, the warmth, and even the mystical profoundness of his thoughts, so unlike the meanness and coldness and barrenness of our prevailing materialism and rationalism. Plato has been to them in philosophy, what the records of the middle ages are to chronicles of dry facts and to the inventions of fiction, as a middle term between truth and falsehood—reality and poetry. It has amused, elevated, and kindled them into many good affections, but without inspiring confidence. They look on him as a noble enthusiast, full of high feeling, and magnificent fancies, but often condescending to subtleties, which are a mere exercise of ingenuity, and indulging in abstractions too high for any practical application. They do not venture to call him in the words of Bacon “*Tumidus poeta, cavillator urbanus, theologus mente captus,*” but they regard him, as so many writers have done before them, more in the form than in the matter of his works; more as the “Homer of Philosophy,”* as “speaking in the language of Jupiter,”† as the “master of Demosthenes,”‡ “in irridendis oratoribus orator summus;”§ or to descend still lower, as the biographer of the most interesting character in antiquity, as the Boswell of Socrates—than as the “*Ille Deus Noster*” of the creator of Roman philosophy,¶ as “the truth-loving Plato” of Clement,|| as the “*Maximus Philosophorum*” of Ambrose,** as the “Grecian Moses” of Numenius—as, in the words of Augustin, “*ille inter discipulos Socratis, qui non immerito excellentissimâ gloriâ claruit, qui omnino cæteros obscuraret,*”†† as the “*prudentissimus philosophorum*” of Jerome, as the “*omnium sapientissimus*” of Lactantius,‡‡ as the “*apex columenque philosophorum*” of Arnobius, as he who, in the words of Eusebius,|||| “alone of all the Greeks reached to the vestibule of truth and stood upon its threshold”—as the “former of Athanasius,”§§ and “the converter of Augustin.”¶¶

It requires indeed considerable knowledge of the history of philosophy to appreciate the whole influence which Plato has exercised upon the human mind; and, still more, a thorough acquaintance with his works to comprehend their real scope and depth. It is therefore not surprising that such an erroneous

* Quintil. lib. x. 1.

† Cicero.

‡ Plutar. in Vit. Mag. p. 1555.

|| Cicer. Orat. 1, 11.

§ Cicer. ad. Att. iv. 16.

¶ Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. 5.

** De Obit. Theod. s. 14.

†† August. de Civit. Dei. lib. 8, c. 8.

‡‡ De Fals. Rel. lib. 1.

|||| Præp. Evang. l. 13, c. 13.

§§ Vit. Athana. edit. Bend. vol. i.

¶¶ Confessions of Augustin.

estimate of his character should generally prevail; so that, as Schleiermacher well observes,* his brilliant passages should have dazzled the eyes of students, until they forgot that in the mind of Plato these were but resting-stones and reliefs (necessary concessions to human weakness) to enable the mind to ascend to a far higher range of thought.

And yet there are certain eras in the history of human reason, in which the operation of Platonism comes out in a form too striking to permit any doubt of its power, or disrespect to its memory. It was something more than eloquence and fancy which Cicero, perplexed as he sometimes seems to be with the dialectical manœuvres of Plato, discovered in those theories through which he proposed to conduct the spirit of philosophy into Rome. It was not mere ingenuity and abstraction, which induced the Reformers of heathenism to adopt his name, so that, in the words of Augustin†, “recentiores quique philosophi nobilissimi, quibus Plato sectandus placuit, noluerint se dici Peripateticos aut academicos, sed Platonicos.” Something more than ordinary reason (and so the wisest Christians always thought) must have informed that spirit which, after lying dormant for three centuries, was resuscitated in the first age of Christianity, and entered into that body of rationalism, which, whether under the name of Gnosticism, or the Alexandrian School, rose up by the side of the true faith to wrestle with it in its untried strength, and to bring out its full form, in precision, by struggles with an antagonist like itself. Once more at the revival of literature Plato was selected as the leader of the new philosophical spirit which was to throw off the yoke of Romanism, and with it the law of Christianity.‡

The revival of deep thought in Germany was in the same manner marked with his name. And in our own country the battle with Hobbes, and the worst forms of philosophical infidelity, was carried on by Cudworth and Smith, and by the deepest of our sound theologians, with the weapons of Plato. A minuter view of the history of human reason would still further illustrate his influence, wherever his philosophy has prevailed. It would suggest also a remarkable comparison between the effects of his system and of that of Aristotle. Wherever Plato has led, he has elevated and improved the human mind. He has been followed too far—farther than Christians may follow him; and many fatal errors have been sheltered under his name. But those which have really sprung from him have been errors of the heart—errors which have not degraded human nature, nor stifled the principle

* Preface to Introduction to Dialogues.

† De Civit. Dei, lib. 8, c. x.

‡ See Preface of Acciaolus to his translation of Theodoret, Curat. Græc. Affect.

of virtue. Even the scepticism of the later academies offers no exception, for it had no authority whatever in the genuine principles of Plato. Enthusiasm, mysticism, and fanaticism, have been the extravagances of Platonism; coldness, materialism, and scepticism, the perversions of Aristotle. Each, when retained in his proper subordination has been a useful servant to the cause of Christianity. But the work which Plato has performed is far higher than that of Aristotle; one has drilled the intellect—the other disciplined the affections; one aided in sinking deep the truths of Christianity, and expanding its form—the other complicated and entangled its parts by endeavouring to reduce them to system; one supplied materials—the other lent instruments to shape them; one fairly met the enemies of Christianity upon the ground of reason—the other secretly gave way to them, without deserting the standard of authority; one, when it rebelled, rebelled openly, and threw up heresies—the other never rebelled, but engendered and supported corruption.

Notwithstanding these characteristic distinctions, and Degerando in an eloquent passage* will point out still more, it would be as erroneous to oppose the two systems to each other as contradictory poles, as to assert, in the words of Cicero, that their differences are purely verbal. In fundamental principles they agree, as all must agree who study one common nature. They spring from one base, but separate into two heads, rising far above all others, meeting us at every turn as we trace the course of later ages, the fathers as it were of all the great subordinate groups which lie around them—the “two twin peaks,” the “bifidum cacumen” of the Greek and of human philosophy.

In the empire which Aristotle and Plato severally and successively enjoyed over the human mind, they possessed many advantages in common. They were both, to use even Bacon's words as taken from the midst of his coarsest abuse, among the most gifted of mankind, “inter maxima mortalium ingenia.” Both were profound observers, and observers of those facts which come home to all our bosoms, and interest all ages, because they lie at the root of all science and all life, the facts of human nature. Both more or less were thrown upon the resources of their own reason—cut off by local revolutions and the “spirit of the age” from immediate connection with the great deposits of Oriental tradition, and compelled, like men upon a desert island, to frame a habitation for their reason from chance materials on the spot, and fragments of scattered wreck. Greek philosophy is in fact the perfection of pure rationalism—from this it derived its energy, and in this, rightly employed, we find its value.

As rationalism, it necessarily took the form of system, at least

* Systemes de la Philosop. vol. ii.

in the mind of its author. Every part which did not fasten into and cohere with the primary hypothesis, was necessarily rejected. Every connection between truths was marked and brought to light. The whole chain of dependent facts was evolved and laid out to be examined; the most delicate shades of truth and falsehood were scrupulously distinguished; and since, for the satisfaction of reason, and in the absence of external authority, no science could exist without demonstration, not only was the whole building solidly and formally cemented, but every stone was rung before it was fixed in its place. It is this accurate technical systematic form which gives the Greek philosophy its great utility in education, or rather makes it essential to any sound scheme of education. It can be found no where else; and without it we could no more teach the science of morals, even possessing, as we do, all its great truths laid down in the Scriptures, than we could instruct in philology by the works of orators and poets without grammars, or teach religion to the young by the Bible without catechisms and articles. To speak of system, indeed, as applied to the works of Plato, will sound very strange to those who have only seen them bit by bit, and probably from a false position. They seem a collection of fragments—here a line and there a line—hint and hypothesis, doubt and dogmatism, feeling and reason, cold mathematical abstraction, and the most gorgeous poetry, the drama and the lecture, the serious and ridiculous, all thrown together with a hand careless in the profuseness of its riches. They bear no more resemblance to the rigid form, determinate proportion, and sharp clear outline of the treatises of Aristotle, than the rough shapeless splashes of scene-painting, to the finish and precision of a miniature. And yet there is art in each—more art and more system in the scene than in the miniature. In the one indeed it lies open to every eye; in the other it is concealed in the artist's mind; and not till he places us in the position from which we are intended to see it, and the portions are properly arranged, and the lights are duly thrown, will those rude unsightly daubings shape themselves into life and beauty.*

This remark leads to another advantage in the Greek philo-

* This illustration is borrowed from a fact: a person went behind the scenes of Drury Lane on the night of a splendid melodrama. In crossing the stage he stumbled over a great board, over which some one apparently had emptied a bucket of red paint, and mopped it off with ink and water. He was on the point of kicking it away, when the scene-shifter cried out in an agony, "Sir, Sir, take care, what are you about there, that's *the bridge*, Sir—Mr. Stanfield's bridge—its the thing that draws the houses." And when he went back to the boxes, he discovered the ruin which he was on the point of causing, by destroying the most striking feature in a landscape worthy of a Claude. Let men, young men especially, remember that there are many such bridges in Plato, and place themselves in the boxes before they purpose to kick them away.

sophy, the exquisite beauty of its form. Whether it was climate, or natural temperament, or education, or social circumstances, that gave to the Greeks their delicate perception of universal beauty, no people ever existed in whose happiness it was so necessary an ingredient, or to whom it was so profusely ministered by the genius of their composers. Their whole nature was in some sort sensualized. And truth stripped of grace and music could no more reach their mind, than religion could touch their heart, except as veiled under a gorgeous mythology. Much of what has been called the poetry of Plato is a concession to this popular weakness. Its occasional extravagance, especially as exhibited in the *Phædrus*, is an intentional and avowed satire. But the dramatic vividness of the dialogue, the harmony of rhythm, the full calm flow of thought and language, and the bursts of passionate inspiration which make Plato the "Homer of Philosophers"—these are all his own—a simple unaffected effluence from his own nature—the instinctive, unconscious creation of an ardent and susceptible mind, gifted not only with a national acuteness of taste, but brought, by the very theory which possessed it, to that feeling and temper from which neither discord nor meanness can flow, and by which every word is grace, because every thought is goodness. Even Aristotle is not destitute of this grace of external form. But it is of a totally different character,—cold, colourless, and still, like the oldest and grandest Grecian sculpture; nothing rich, nothing superfluous; the words clinging to the thoughts like moistened drapery to a marble statue, and giving beauty by transparency alone. Still there is beauty of form, and beauty in perfect harmony with the thoughts which it clothes. And how entirely this principle of correspondence prevails, cannot be better seen than by imagining the syllogisms of Aristotle loaded with the robings of Plato, and the grand flowing thoughts of Plato left bare beneath the thin veil of Aristotle.

This beauty of external form is not the least—it is perhaps the greatest source of the influence of the Grecian philosophy. It is also a peculiar condition required in an instrument of education. Those at least will acknowledge this, who believe with Plato in the close harmony of soul and body; in the analogy of beauty to itself wherever it really exists, in sound or language, colour or feeling, proportion or virtue; in the identity of real beauty and real goodness, and therefore in the necessity of providing for the young, as our Maker has provided for us, an external creation of loveliness to be the type and monitor and preparation for an internal creation of virtue.

"We must seek out," he says in the *Republic*,* "for those who are to supply us with the forms of art, men who, by instinct, can

* Lib. 3, p. 102.

trace out the springs of grace and beauty; that dwelling as in a sanctuary of health, the young may imbibe good from all around them—from every work and sight and sound, whence aught may strike their sense—like airs that are wafting health from purest climes, and step by step from childhood are changing them into the image of goodness, and into likeness, and love, and harmony with the beauty of truth.”

These few observations may point out generally why the state of Grecian philosophy in our great schools of Christian education requires to be diligently watched; and in some degree why the course which it takes indicates, like a float upon the water, the direction of the current of the times. It is the great instrument of education still. It always has been the great stimulus to the activity of the human mind. The study of it has gone hand in hand with advancing civilization. The loss of it has been followed by decay not only in science, but in art, and in all things to which art ministers.

We may, on a future occasion, trace out this remarkable fact historically. We may also examine the various relations which have at different periods existed between the Greek Philosophy and Christianity; and ascertain the true principles upon which an alliance may be established between them with safety and advantage to each. The former question would supply the answer to the wretched and ignorant clamour in behalf of “physical science and useful knowledge” as a substitute in education for the Greek Philosophy. The latter will not be necessary so long as the Church of England retains her true position, and insensibly preserves the balance between her several faculties and functions by recognizing external authority as a control over individual opinion. It is the operation of this great maxim which has easily and secretly hitherto, but most efficaciously, enabled the University of Oxford to exercise her students in the very centre of scepticism—in systems founded wholly on rationalism, and therefore full of the poison, without risking any infection. She has taught them to reason and prove, without making reason and proof essential conditions of belief. She has inspired them with reverence for heathens, without forgetting themselves to be Christians. She has put into their hands the weapons which have so often been turned against the truth, without tempting their employment against herself. And the humility, sobriety and thoughtfulness which her course of study has stamped upon their characters, both in religion and in social life, is the best answer to the problem of Tertullian, which can be solved in no other way.

“*Quid ergo Athenis et Hierosolymis? Quid Academiæ et Ecclesiæ? quid hæreticis et Christianis? Nostra institutio de Porticu Salomonis est, qui et ipse tradiderat Dominum in simplicitate cordis esse quærendum.*”

Viderint qui Stoicum, et Platonium, et Dialecticum Christianismum protulerunt."—*Tertull. de Præscript.*

Without however entering further into this question at present, it may not be uninteresting to point out some of those peculiar principles in the philosophy of Plato, which seem in England to have found a congenial soil in the spirit of the present day, and which, simultaneously indeed, but under far other circumstances than in Germany and France, will probably take root and spread.

In England Plato will not be selected as our guide, because we want authority for moral truth, for we possess such authority already, far higher and far more conclusive than any testimony of his—in the witness of the Church. Nor will his name be advanced as a sanction for that foolish eclectic vanity which would place itself in the centre of all systems, like a low-born usurper in the midst of conquered sovereigns, to judge, condemn, applaud, or ridicule, taking from each what we choose, and casting off the rest in scorn; while all truth is subjected to the test of our arbitrary fancies, and far wiser men than ourselves are insulted by our contemptuous independence. This is the eclectic spirit which it is proposed to revive in France—very different from the eclectic maxims of the Alexandrian school, which sought in different systems for one common acknowledged stock of truth, rather than for community in error; and directly opposed to Plato, who combined indeed much from others, but never lost sight of an hereditary doctrine, on which all others were to be engrafted, whether he traced it openly to the East, or revived it without name from Pythagoras.

To take from a competent authority a system which may afterwards be enlarged or modified, or defined by experience and by the testimony of others, but which in every inquiry is the basis upon which the enlargement proceeds, is a wise and a necessary rule. It is the process of nature in the development of the understanding, just as much as in the expansion of the embryo body. The whole oak lies hid in the acorn, but its fibres shoot out and spread by assimilating to themselves the nutriment which lies about its roots.

This is sound eclecticism. But to acknowledge no leading system—to receive nothing from authority—to become what Bacon erroneously desired, while he confessed that it had never existed, "of so constant and severe a mind as to have determined and tasked ourselves utterly to abolish theories and common notions, and to apply our intellect altogether smoothed and even to particulars anew;" this, which is the plan contemplated in the rationalistic eclecticism of France, and is very much affected by all men in this age, in pure wilfulness, without the pretensions of philosophy,

is as impossible from the nature of man, as it would be destructive to all knowledge whatever. We may as well expect a tree to spring up except from a seed, or a man to accumulate wealth with neither capital nor credit to commence with.

In England, at least so long as the education of the English nation is carried on by the Church, we shall not tolerate any such absurdities. We shall not prohibit, but rather encourage all experiment, all reasoning, all proof, all additions to our knowledge which really are additions. But we shall not launch men upon the sea without giving them charts, and compasses, and sounding lines. We shall not expect them to move on without some firm foundation to move upon. We shall not call upon them to grow while we are cutting off their roots, or to become rich while we are reducing them to poverty. We shall ensure them a capital of knowledge, and that knowledge will be Christianity—and Christianity as it is countersigned, and guaranteed by the best of all possible securities, the witness of the Church.

This then is the spirit in which all philosophy may be made a most valuable instrument of education—Grecian philosophy especially, in an education, whose subject is man in his relation to the spiritual world—and Platonism most of all at a time when a vast harvest of follies are springing up in the country, precisely the same as those, against which his highest powers were directed, and which must be crushed and rooted out by the whole force of truth and reason, whether by the truth of God in revelation, or by the reason of man in philosophy.

No men have more mistaken the nature of Plato's system, than those who have regarded it as a speculative fabric, such as men of powerful intellect have wrought out at times in schools and cloisters, when the tranquillity of society enabled them to think, without any necessity for action. Much, if not all, of the Eastern philosophy was of this caste. It sprung up like a tree in the desert, very beautiful, but very useless, under an atmosphere fixed and changeless, perfect in all its outlines from the absence of any thing to disturb it. Such also was much of the new Alexandrian speculations, until Julian brought them to bear practically upon the purification of the Heathen Polytheism. Such also was scholasticism, and many of the rival theories which have since sprung up in Germany under the stimulus of a craving curiosity, which found nothing to do but to think. The questions which would naturally form the materials of such philosophers are candidly and almost ludicrously stated by Kant.*

“Utrum mundus initium habeat, et terminum quempiam extensionis in spatio; utrum uspiam, et fortasse in memetipso cogitante individua

* *Artis. Element. p. 2, lib. 2, c. 2.*

quædam unitas sit, atque incorruptibilis, an nihil sit, nisi dividuum et caducum; utrum in actionibus liber sim, an quemadmodum naturæ cæteræ, ad filum naturæ ducar fatigue; utrum denique suprema mundi causa exstet, an res naturales, earumque ordo in re objectâ ultimâ versentur, in quâ in omnibus deliberationibus nostris consistendum nobis sit, quæstiones sunt illæ quidem, cum quarum solutione universam scientiam suam mathematicus libenter commutaret, quippe quæ ratione summorum gravissimorumque finium generi humano propositorum, nil quidquam potest aperire in quo acquiescat."

One might have thought that this was but a poor and barren field for a mighty genius to expatiate in,—that but one answer could be found to these problems; and that one very simple and brief, within our own consciousness or our own ignorance;—that life, which is short to learn, is very long to feel in, and an absolute eternity to act in;—and that in the miseries of life, and the agonies of death, what we may feel and what we ought to do, are the high and awful questions, the "summi gravissimique fines" proposed to the knowledge of mankind. Even the heathen Persius could tell us better the end of man's philosophy.

"Quid sumus, et quidnam victuri gignimur? ordo
Quis datus? et metæ mollis quis flexus, et unde?
Quis modus argento? quid fas optare? quid asper
Utile nummus habet? Patriæ charisque propinquis
Quantum elargiri debet? Quem te Deus esse
Jussit, et humanâ quâ parte locatus es in re."

Pers. Satyr.

And Plato thought so likewise; and to these abstract speculatists themselves, and to others who have ranked him with them, the Ritters, and Schleiermachers, and Cousins, and Dejerandos, who valuable as their commentaries are, seem all to have fallen into this error, he would answer in the words of Augustin,

"Quo pacto anima tua, tam docta et ingeniosa (ubi te multum dolemus) per hæc mysteria doctrinæ ad Deum suum, id est a quo facta est, non cum quo facta est, nec cujus portio, sed cujus conditio, nec qui est omnium anima, sed qui fecit omnem animam, quo solo illustrante fit anima beata, si ejus gratiæ non sit ingrata, hoc modo potest pervenire."*

We shall never understand the value of Plato's philosophy, and still less the arrangement and dependence of its parts, without viewing it in this light, as a practical, not a speculative system. Even considered as a revival of the modified doctrine of Pythagoras, which probably is the true point of view, it is still practical. Pythagoras was full of other thoughts than the abstract relations of numbers, when he organized his wonderful society to restore something of right government and religious subordination

* De Civit. Dei, lib. 7.

in the republics of Magna Græcia. He was as far from dreaming away his reason in empty metaphysics, though high and abstract truth was a necessary condition of his system, as Loyola was from resting in the subtleties of scholastic theology, when he created his singular polity for upholding the Romanist faith.*

Plato's great object was man. He lived with man, felt as a man, held intercourse with kings, interested himself deeply in the political revolutions of Sicily, was the pupil of one whose boast it was, to have brought down philosophy from heaven to earth, that it might raise man up from earth to heaven; and, above all, he was a witness and an actor in the midst of that ferment of humanity exhibited in the democracy of Athens. When states are at peace, and property secure, and the wheels of common life move on regularly and quietly upon their fixed lines, men with active minds may sit and speculate upon the stars, or analyze ideas. But it is not so in the great convulsions of society. The object constantly before the eyes of Plato was the incorporated spirit, the μέγα θρόμμα† of human lawlessness. He saw it indeed in an exhausted state, its power passed away, its splendour torn off, and all the sores and ulcers‡ which former demagogues had pampered and concealed, now laid bare and beyond cure. But it was still a spectacle to absorb the mind of every good and thoughtful man. The state of the Athenian democracy is the real clue to the philosophy of Plato. It would be proved, if by nothing else, by one little touch in the Republic. The Republic is the summary of his whole system, and the keystones of all the other dialogues are uniformly let into it. But the object of the Republic is to exhibit the misery of man let loose from law, and to throw out a general plan for making him subject to law, and thus to perfect his nature. It is exhibited on a large scale in the person of a State, and in the masterly historical sketch which in the 8th & 9th books he draws of the changes of society, having painted in the minutest detail the form of a licentious democracy, he fixes it by the slightest allusion, (it was perhaps all that he could hazard,) on the existing state of Athens; and then passes on to a frightful prophecy of that tyranny which would inevitably follow. All the other dialogues bring us to the Republic, and the Republic brings us to this as its end and aim.

On this view every part of his system will fall naturally into place. Even questions apparently farthest from any practical intention are thus connected with his plan. If in the Sophist

* See Meisner, *Histoire de l'Origine des Sciences dans la Grèce*, for a very interesting view of the school of Pythagoras, and one which gives a very useful introduction to the school of Plato.

† Repub. lib. 6, p. 219.

‡ Gorgias, p. 109.

he indulges in the most subtle analysis of our notion of being, it is to overthrow the fundamental fallacy of that metaphysical school which was denying all virtue by confounding all truth, and thus poisoning human nature at its source, and justifying the grossest crimes both of the state and of its leaders.* If he returns again and again to his noble theory of Ideas, it is to fix certain immutable distinctions of right and wrong, good and evil; and to raise up the mind to the contemplation of a Being of perfect goodness, prior in existence, superior in power, unamenable in its independence to those fancies and passions of mankind, which had become before the eyes of Plato, in individuals, unbridled lusts, and in the state an insanity of tyranny. If in the *Parmenides* he takes us into the abstrusest mysteries of metaphysics, the nature of unity and number—this also was rendered necessary, not only to obviate objection to his own theory of ideas, but to fix the great doctrine of unity in a Divine Being—unity in goodness—one truth in action and thought,—as opposed to that polytheism of reason which makes every man's conscience his god. It grappled also with a mystery which meets us at the foundation of every deep theory, and in the forms of every popular belief, in Christianity as well as in heathenism; a mystery which true in itself as wholly distinct from man, has yet a corresponding mystery in the constitution of the human mind—and which compelled even the heathen philosopher to state the same seeming paradox for the very foundation of his system, which Christianity lays down at once as its grand and all comprehensive doctrine. All unity implies plurality—all plurality must end in unity. So also the inquiry in the *Theætetus* into the nature of science bore no resemblance whatever in its object to any mere speculative theories of Kant or his followers. It was a necessary part of that system which was to become the antagonist of the Sophists, and to contend for the preservation of truth against a ruinous sensualism and empiricism, which was sapping all the foundations of society. Even the seemingly frivolous and often wearisome subtleties which occur in the *Sophist*, the *Euthydemus*, and the *Politicus*, are intended as dialectical exercises for the pupil whom Plato is forming to become the saviour and guardian of a state. Even the philological absurdities of the *Cratylus* are to be explained in the same way. He perpetually suggests the fact in the dialogues themselves. And in the *Republic*† he gives at length the principles on which they are introduced.

Very much of the plan of his dialogues, for reasons which he himself supplies, and which it will occur to mention hereafter, is purposely left in obscurity. And the test of the statement here made must lie in a careful reference to the works themselves.

* *Gorgias*, 1.

† *B.* 7.

But it is impossible to believe that Plato, the "first of philosophers," who made practical goodness and duty the one great end of life, whose whole history, as well as his theories, are full of views not of speculative fancies but of practical improvement to society,*—the friend of Dion, the adviser of Dionysius, the pupil of Socrates, the writer of the *Republic* and the *Laws*, who recognized indeed intellect and truth as necessary conditions of man's perfection, but made "the good and the beautiful" his heart and his affections, the ruling principle of his actions—who never looked down upon minds beneath him without thinking of the task of education; and never raised his eyes to that image of the Deity which he had formed from all imaginable perfection, without seeing in it not merely an abstraction of intellect, unity, identity, eternity, but goodness and love, and justice—the† Maker of the world, because he delighted in the happiness of his creatures; the Dispenser of rewards beyond the‡ grave;§ the Cause of all good things—the Father and King of all;—it is impossible to believe that such a man, with strong affections, consummate devotion to his end, absolute unity of purpose inculcated in all his doctrines, and exhibited in the outlines of his work, should have stood before any scene of humanity, least of all before the spectacle of an Athenian democracy, without having his whole soul possessed by man and the relations of man, instead of things and the relations of things—that he should have wasted those powers, so elevated and so pure, in idle subtleties—that he should have thrown out his fancies in fragments as one whose life was aimless—or that wrought as they are in every line with a consummate art, linked together to the observing eye by ten thousand of the finest reticulations, they were not intended as a system; and as a system will come out to us when the focus is rightly adjusted, and the whole is regarded as a mighty effort to elevate man to his perfection, and his perfection where only it can be reached, in a social and political form.

We are most anxious to fix attention on this point, (let it be a fancy—take it as hypothesis, only try it,) because wherever it has been lost (and we cannot name the commentator who has wholly found it) the whole of Plato's works have been viewed in inextricable confusion. Even Schleiermacher has failed in his clue. Men seem to have wandered about as in a maze—here admiring, there perplexed—there completely at a stand. No order—no limits—no end. Fragments have been dealt with as wholes, and wholes as fragments; irony mistaken for earnestness, and earnestness for irony; play for the fancy gravely dealt with as meditation for the reason, and exercises for boys treated as the serious occupation of men. Spurious pieces have been admitted which

* *Conviv.* p. 260.† *Timæus*.‡ *Phæd.*§ *Republic*, b. x.

destroyed all consistency of thought. Doubts raised to remove error or rouse curiosity have been carried off as final decisions, until Plato, the very dogmatist of philosophy, has been made the ringleader of Pyrrhonists and Sceptics. And even the holiest and purest of ethics, which never stopped short of its object till man's mind was withdrawn from* sense and his heart was fixed upon its God, has been calumniated and perverted.

But take this central position—look as a philosopher on man, and on man in his whole personality, as a living immortal soul, instinct with affection and feeling, which cannot rest except in beings like himself. See him vainly struggling to realize that noble creation for which he was formed at first, and to raise up a polity or church in the faculties of his own nature, and from the members of civil society—then contemplate the wreck of such a plan in the contaminated youth and remorseless tyranny of the Athenian commonwealth—all that was noble in its nature, its “lion heart” and “human reason,”† “starved, emaciated, and degraded;” and the “many-headed monster of its passions,” πολυκεφαλὸν θρίμμα, “howling round and tearing it to pieces”—and then a new light will fall upon the meaning and order of those works, which were intended to do all that mere philosophy could do—to raise a solemn protest against the sins which it witnessed; to overthrow the sophistries which pandered to those corruptions; to open a nobler scene; and to create some yearning for its attainment in those few untainted minds which nature had prepared for its enjoyment.

In this view all will be clear—the grand close of all the dialogues in the Republic and Laws; the striking mode in which all the rest are worked into these two; the commencement of them in the Phædrus, and the perfect consistency of that piece, in any other view so wild and heterogeneous; the deep melancholy tone which pervades every allusion of Plato to the scenes before his eyes; the anticipation of coming evil; the sort of prophetic elevation as he opens his “dream” of that city, wherein all goodness should dwell—“whether‡ such has ever existed in the infinity of days gone by, or even now exists in some regions of the East far from our sight and knowledge, or will be perchance hereafter”—but “which,§ though it be not on earth, must have a pattern of it laid up in heaven, for him who wishes to behold it, and beholding resolves to dwell there.”

So also we shall enter into the educational character of his works; their high practical morality, the mode in which every question is carried up into the nature of truth, and through truth is connected with virtue—the position which theology occupies, and the practical mode in which it is applied; the absence of those

* Phæd. † Repub. b. 9, p. 345. ‡ Ib. b. 6, p. 238. § Ib. b. 9, p. 349.

abstract metaphysical speculations on the nature of the Deity, into which human reason always falls when it analyzes mental conceptions beyond what practical duty requires; and into which the Neo-Platonicians did fall, and still more the Gnostics, while they boasted of their own ingenuity, and ridiculed Plato as one who had not, like them, penetrated "into the depths of the Intelligible Essence."*

Even the form of Plato's works will derive new light and beauty from considering them as instruments of instruction, not vehicles for speculation. The mode in which curiosity is roused by the fractured lines of the dialogue; the arresting the attention by demanding an answer to every position; the gradual opening of difficulties; the carrying of the eye and imagination to the truth by portions of broken winding stairs of argument, leading to dark recesses, and ruinously hung together in masses, rather than the throwing open before the reader an easy ascending plane, which requires no labour, and stimulates no thought—So also the successive overthrow of opinions—the sudden starting up of doubts in apparently the most open ground—the skill with which the drama of the argument is broken up into scenes and acts, heightened by a stage decoration, and relieved with the solemn or the grotesque—the rich melo-dramatic myths which so often close them—the character of Socrates himself embodying the attributes and duties of the Greek chorus—the selection of the parties among the young—the tests which are applied to ascertain if they possess the qualities of mind, which, in the Republic,† are declared to be necessary for those who are to make any progress in goodness—the gradual development of the system in exact proportion to the industry and ingenuity of the hearer—and the order of the sceptical dialogues, all more or less destructive of errors without any declaration of the truth, and forming series of enigmas, to lead like an avenue of sphinxes to the grand open portal of the republic—all these and many other points will assume a wholly different character, whether we consider Plato's work as intended to declare his opinions, or as constructed for the purpose of extricating, by a tried and thoughtful process, the minds which it was still possible to save from the follies and sins and miseries in which the madness of the age and a vicious system of education were plunging them.

All this to persons who never read Plato, or read him carelessly and contemptuously, as men in this day do read whatever they do not understand, at the first glimpse will appear exaggerated and enthusiastic. And no answer can be given but a demand that the trial should be made—and the hypothesis taken as a clue. If it is false, it will fail. But none whom wise men would wish to

* Porph. Vit. Plat. c. 14.

† B. 7.

follow have ever approached the name of Plato without reverence and gratitude. All have been impressed especially with his exquisite skill as an artist or constructor of his works;* and none have drawn a plan which gives harmony and symmetry to them all. Some plan however must exist. If we want to form a judgment on the grandeur of some vast cathedral, we do not plant ourselves in a nook, before some disproportioned arch, or out of sight of the central aisle. We seek for that point of view in which the builder himself beheld it before he commenced the work, and then the whole fabric comes out. And the illustration will bear to be dwelt on. Whoever studies Plato is treading on holy ground. So heathens always felt it. So even Christianity confessed.† And we may stand among his venerable works as in a vast and consecrated fabric—vistas and aisles of thoughts opening on every side—high thoughts that raise the mind to heaven—pillars and niches and cells within cells mixing in seeming confusion, and a veil of tracery, and foliage, and grotesque imagery thrown over all, but all rich with a light streaming “through dim religious forms”—all leading up to God—all blest with an effluence from Him, though an effluence dimmed and half lost in the contaminated reason of man.

The early Church never looked on the pure and elevated truths scattered through the Grecian philosophy, and especially in the works of Plato, without recognizing in them an emanation, more or less direct, from the “fountain of all wisdom.”

“If they argue,” says Clement, “it was by accident the Greeks gave utterance to portions of true philosophy, that accident was the work of a divine economy; for, with all their rivalry against us, no one will make accident a god. If by some strange coincidence, the coincidence itself is providential. If they assert that the Greeks possessed a natural intuition of truth, we know but one author of nature, even God; as we know but one author of righteousness, and yet speak of a natural righteousness as distinct from the righteousness by Christ. If that they shared in one common intellect, who is the father of this? If they speak of supernatural enunciations, these are but forms of prophecy. Others declare that those philosophers saw indeed truths, but only in reflections and shadows. Is it the less true for this? What does the divine Apostle say of ourselves? ‘For now we see through a glass darkly.’ And so they among the Greeks, who attained to the truths of philosophy, saw the Divine Nature, though only in far shadows and reflections; and yet such shadows and reflections, which are all that we are now capable of perceiving, partake nevertheless of truth, as reflections which are formed in water.” (*Clement. Alexand. Strom. b. i. p. 316.*)

This is the substance of one of the most condensed views on

* Schleiermacher, *Introd. Preface.*

† *Clem. Alex. l. i. p. 39, 316; Theodoret, Græc. Aff. lib. i. et passim.*

the relation of heathen philosophy to revealed truth which occurs in the early fathers. A still more eloquent passage is found in Theodoret, and though long, it is worth transcribing. Any thing which can bring us to the study of such a writer as Plato with a sober reverential feeling, divested of that flippancy and conceit which must distort all our notions, and render our minds inaccessible to any sound elevated doctrines, is well worth a little delay. And the passages are not the less valuable because with the respect which they profess they carry also the antidote to any exaggerated submission to an authority other than the Church.

“Go then,” says Theodoret, “to the Greeks, go to your own philosophers, who initiate you before we do; and who teach what we would teach you. For they are like to those birds of song which imitate the voice of man, but know not the meaning of the words they utter. Even so these reason indeed of the things belonging unto God, though they know little of the truths whereof they speak. And yet they are not without excuse. They enjoyed no succession of prophets, passing the torch of truth from hand to hand; no apostolic illumination to be a light to their feet and a lantern to their paths. Nature alone was their teacher, though her handwriting, engraven on the heart by the finger of God, the wanderings of a sinful life long since obliterated. And yet some remains of this, He, who first stamped it on their souls, renewed at times, and allowed them not wholly to perish, by displaying to mankind, through his works, his providence and power. And thus the Apostle has shown in his sermon at Lystra, where, in addition to much else, he says, ‘Who in times past suffered all nations to walk in their own ways. Nevertheless, he left not himself without witness in that he did good, and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness.’

“The seed of Abraham,” he proceeds, “received the oracles of God, and enjoyed the grace of the teaching of his prophets. The other nations, through the works of nature and the creation, were led to a knowledge of their God by Him who is Lord of all things. And as in his wonderful bounty he sends his rain, chiefly indeed on the cultivated soil, and that for the service of man, and yet, from the abundance of his goodness, he waters even the deserts and the mountains; and the land which man has ploughed brings forth a perfect fruit, and that which he has not laboured brings forth wild fruit; and we see at times the fig-tree shooting forth upon tombs and among ruins; even so the grace of knowledge, in a more peculiar manner, is given to holy men, and yet even to others it is vouchsafed, as rain to the wilderness and forest; and hence even there fruits spring up that are fit for food, and are like to the produce of the plough. And yet it is easy to see that they have never been blessed by the culture of God’s prophets, for there is a roughness mingled within them and a gall of bitterness; and they who know how to discern between the good and the evil gather that which is fit for use and the rest they leave, as they who gather roses leave the thorns behind, but collect the blossoms. And such also is the instinct of the bees, for they settle not only on the sweet but on the bitter

flowers, and the sweetness they extract and the bitterness they eschew ; and from qualities most contrary, bitter and sour, and rough and sharp, they prepare sweetest honey for man. And these we also imitate. And from those fields of your philosophy, so full of bitterness, we provide the sweet honey for your salvation. And as they that heal our bodies concoct from venomous beasts drugs that will heal their wounds, and even from the flesh of vipers can extract antidotes to disease, so we also take in hand the works of your poets and historians and philosophers, and rejecting some parts as noxious and concocting others with the sound word of our doctrine, we apply the healing medicine to your souls." (*Theodoret. Græc. Affec. Curat. lib. 1.*)

It would be easy to collect many more passages of the same import, and others still more immediately connecting the great truths of the Platonic philosophy with an anterior revelation, and especially with the books of Moses. Justin, Clement, Eusebius, and others, speak of it as an acknowledged fact. Aristobulus, the Jewish peripatetic, asserted the same thing. And although both Jerome and Augustin have chronologically refuted the notion that he had enjoyed direct communication with certain of the prophets, there are scattered throughout his works such singular coincidences with Scripture, not merely such as might spring up spontaneously in different minds, viewing human nature from one common point, but seemingly borrowed and transferred, as might at least easily reconcile an attentive reader to an hypothesis of the kind.

Our object, however, at present is to apply the suggestion which has been thrown out as to the practical character of Plato's writings, to a more detailed examination of the writings themselves, in the conviction that no little good may be done by assisting in turning the attention of the generation now entering into life to the largest and noblest treasure-house existing in human literature, whether of eloquence, of beauty, of elevated moral principles, of profound metaphysics, or of political wisdom. Schleiermacher has done more than any one to throw the dialogues into an intelligible order. If we think that he has not perfectly succeeded in obtaining the precise clue to their perplexities, something must be allowed to a prejudice in favour of a different hypothesis. No admirers of Plato can be insensible to the assistance which Schleiermacher, Ritter, Ast, Tenneman, Van Heusde, and many other foreign critics have rendered to the study of his system. But there is something in the atmosphere which we breathe that modifies all our views, as it colours the objects of vision. And the deep metaphysical character of the later philosophical schools of Germany seems to have given an undue bias to their mind when examining the

philosophy of the Greeks. Van Heusde has some sensible remarks on the necessity of guarding against this tendency to see all things after one fashion, and to interpret the writings of others, of men often in the most opposite circumstances, as if they had always looked through our own eyes. He compares it, not infelicitously, to the romance writers of the middle ages, who represented Cæsar and Alexander the Great travelling the country as knight-errants.

Schleiermacher has well pointed out the utter futility of all the old attempts to arrange the Dialogues in any consistent plan. The forms of trilogies and tetralogies which could not even be generally completed, and which, in the few instances of completion, brought together the most opposite subjects without even a common plot, may be rejected at once. The idea is valuable only in one point of view, as expressing strongly a conviction of the dramatic nature of the dialogues. The classification of them by their logical character, as “dogmatic, refutative, or tentative,” and the like, is indeed by no means to be despised. On the contrary, it is one of the most important clues to a full understanding of their relative position. But it is not sufficient, because it embraces only the form of the works without touching on the matter. And although in Plato’s system the two are inseparably connected, almost as body and mind, the matter must occupy by far the most prominent place. It must supply the basis of the arrangement. The attempt to form a chronological series is still more vain. We have no external testimony to guide us, except in one or two cases. Internal evidence there is none, for the narrative is full of anachronisms so glaring as to be evidently intentional; and the conjectures which may be drawn from an altered tone of sentiment or style must be open to all the vagueness of the rashest criticism. How little any such judgment can be trusted may be gathered from the extreme difficulty of distinguishing between the spurious and genuine dialogues, and also from the glaring mistakes which have occurred in them already, from a misunderstanding of the object of the several parts. Even if we knew the dates of the publication of each dialogue it would assist us but little in fixing the order in which they should be read; for any man with a system ready formed in his mind will throw it out portion by portion, according as the train of thought may happen to present itself. Such a work is

* We cannot allude to Schleiermacher’s introduction, which has been recently translated into English, without lamenting in one instance the perfect fidelity of the translator. It is generally considered one of the most harsh and unreadable books in the German language, and in its present form it stands, undoubtedly, at the head of the same class of books in this country. It has lost nothing of its pre-eminence of obscurity.

not like the erection of a house, in which the foundation must in time precede the walls, and the walls be raised before the roof. It is rather like the planting an estate, and where we begin and where we end may depend on the accident of the moment, without any departure from the original plan.

The artist-like development of the philosophical system is the principle in which Schleiermacher, with great skill and insight into the character of the Platonic writings, has proposed to arrange them; and this consideration must have great weight in every attempt of the kind. The main outlines of such a plan must coincide with that which would be formed in more direct reference to the practical object of Plato. Still we think that the connection will be more easy, and the series more natural, and, in particular, (that which constitutes the great difficulty,) the parts of each several dialogue will arrange themselves in greater consistency by bearing in mind throughout that the young men of Athens were the persons to whom they were expressly addressed; that the purification of their morals—the refutation of their corruptors, the sophists—the elevation of the standard of private and political morality—the laying a firm foundation for a new national character—the cleansing, or endeavouring to cleanse, that Augean stable of the Grecian democracy—and the opening a new world of thought and feeling, as yet hidden behind the veil of a gross sensualistic polytheism,—that these, and not merely the foundation of a metaphysical school, or the development and propagation of barren truth, were constantly before the mind of Plato, guiding his thought and his pen throughout, and offering the only explanation to those innumerable mysteries and anomalies which meet us in every page of his works—which have made many men abandon them in despair, some play with them as a complicated enigma, others ridicule them as an unintelligible chaos, a whole succession of philosophical schools claim him as the champion of their scepticism, and even Cicero himself declare that “Plato never hazards an assertion, but argues on both sides” of the question, and then leaves the reader in his doubt.”

It is this view also of the subject which places Plato in such direct contrast to Aristotle, especially in their ethical treatises. Aristotle expressly declares that he writes not for the young but for the old.* Plato’s argument is chiefly carried on in the form of conversation with youth. Hence Aristotle’s reasoning is synthetic, commencing with principles too high for undisciplined minds to understand. Plato’s is wholly analytic, grappling at once with prejudices and follies, and purifying truth from error, by sifting it and bringing it to the light. The form of Aristotle

* Nicom. Eth. b. i. c. 3.

is grave, simple, and such as would become a philosopher addressing philosophers. Plato is full of every art to captivate the fancy, winning, dramatic, eloquent, full of digression, now relieving the mind by the most playful humour, now rising into solemnity and poetry; always striking, always impressed with the necessity of condescending to an unformed hearer.

There cannot be a more striking instance of these characteristics, nor a more complete argument in proof of the hypothesis suggested, than the first dialogue, with which, by common consent, the series must open—the *Phædrus*. Historically we know from Diogenes, that this was the first in order of publication. Internally it contains the germ of all the others. And there is no part of the Platonic philosophy of which the seed may not be found carefully introduced into this singular, and, at first sight, perplexing composition. The same fact has been inferred from the poetical and overcharged style of several portions of it; but as in many other instances the commentator (*Dionysius*) has entirely mistaken an intentional caricature for a serious and elaborate production. Even *Schleiermacher* seems to have fallen into the same error. The conclusion is just, that the *Phædrus* is the first of the dialogues; the premises are false, that the date is betrayed by a juvenile extravagance of style. Such an extravagance undoubtedly exists; but when the object of the dialogue is examined on the principle which it is proposed to employ, it will be found perfectly consistent with the utmost severity of thought. From the *Phædrus* all the other dialogues run out through a series of sceptical unconclusive disputations, to four great works of an entirely different character, grave, massive, dogmatic, and final—the *Republic*, the *Laws*, the *Timæus*, and the unfinished fragment of the *Critias*. These four form one grand group openly connected together. And there is not a question left unsettled in any one of the former dialogues which does not find its solution here, a solution unmixed with a particle of doubt, thrown off frequently in a single sentence, without condescending, as it were, to inquire if any doubt ever had existed; at other times carrying back the mind by some little touch which only an attentive reader would observe, to former unfinished discussions on the same subject, and by completing them, developing the whole, just as in some well-planned illumination, a dark and shapeless building will run into a blaze of light at the touch of a single torch.

We propose then, at present, to close our observations with an analysis of the *Phædrus*, considered not only as the first specimen of Plato's system of instruction, but as evidently intended by him to form a preface and introduction to the rest, and to give a general intimation of the principles on which all his works are

constructed. Previous to this we must ask attention to a few more general observations, without which we shall be ill prepared for a more detailed inquiry.

In the first place, in selecting the *Phædrus* as the point from which the reader of Plato may commence, and so work his way to the *Republic*, it must not be forgotten that there is another course, in which we begin with the *Republic*, and end with the *Phædrus*. It is the peculiarity of all analytical reasoning, that it admits of this double process, like reptiles that can advance with their tails just as well as with their heads. In synthetical reasoning, as for instance in Aristotle, we commence with a certainty, and follow on to a certainty. In analytical, we commence with a doubt, and so try our way to a certainty. In the one case we go by a known road from a place, which we know to be York, to London, which we never yet saw; in the other, we get upon a coach at York, and go off on a journey to discover by the places to which we arrive at last, whether the place from which we started was York or Dublin. In the one case we know we are on a continent, and journey on steadily and quietly till we choose to stop. In the other, we want to know whether we are in an island or not, and we strike out in all directions till we meet the sea in every part. Analytical reasoning, therefore, necessarily presumes a return to the principles from which we started, and which were in fact assumed merely as hypotheses and questions. If they are true, it is felt they will lead to such and such results, and if the results follow, the premises are held to be true.

It is evident, also, that when the journey has once been made, we may easily return upon our steps by ourselves, and make it a second time, with far more leisure to examine the scenery, and note down the direction-posts. Whereas the first time that we issue out on speculation, we shall require some guide to assist us, or be compelled at every step to ask where we are going. In synthetical reasoning this is not necessary, and the whole process may be performed alone. Without stopping to do more than suggest the important difference thus established between the two plans of teaching, with respect to the encouragement of a docile and trustful, or of a presumptuous rationalistic spirit—effects very strongly marked on the two schools of Plato and Aristotle—it may now be seen why there are wholly different modes of reading Plato, according as we are provided with an external clue to his meaning, or not. A young man who takes up Plato, without the slightest conception of the general scope and plan of his works, and without assistance from without, must begin with his dogmatic works. Tenneman proposes the *Republic*, and he is perfectly right, only it must be accompanied by the *Laws*, the

Timæus, and the Critias. He will then see clearly the general principles which are to be developed gradually in the preparatory dialogues, and they will serve, not indeed as a perfect clue, but as a guiding point, like a distant spire in the difficulties of a steeple-chase. He will be able to watch, in those dialogues, their development with interest, and to join his own exertions in unravelling the plot of an argument, when he knows something of the coming catastrophe. But even with such assistance, the task will be difficult, and often tedious; and requires far more attention and power of mind than can be commonly expected. The most obvious mode of facilitating the study of Plato, is, therefore, to supply the student, from an external quarter, with a general outline of the principles intended to be established; to tell him, in fact, where he is going, and then accompany him in the journeys, commencing with the *Phædrus* and the other sceptical dialogues, and gradually bringing him to the clear and expansive prospect which opens in the *Republic*. In this way his mind will be placed in the position contemplated throughout by Plato himself. He will work out truth in a great degree by his own energies, evolve right conclusions from the mixed truth and falsehood of his own original notions, and borrow only so much aid from his teacher as is required to bring to light the original conceptions of his nature.* To do this thoroughly, we require, first, a clear intelligible outline of the Platonic philosophy, which every young man may understand; then distinct introductions to each of the dialogues, pointing out the course of the reasonings, and fixing attention on the thousand minute delicacies and incidental hints which give shape and animation to the whole. Something of this kind, but we confess very briefly and imperfectly, has been attempted by most commentators. Cousin's are short headings, where the subject is treated in a bold, off-hand, sketchy French style, too pleasing to be very deep, or to create much confidence in the writer. Schleiermacher's are profoundly obscure; and not sufficiently detailed to initiate the student into the whole art and beautiful coherence of the several structures. And until some person thoroughly inspired with the soul of Plato, viewing things with his eyes, and devoting his whole mind to that one object, shall have examined the minutest point with the same confidence in their use and design with which an anatomist regards some new discovered fibre, or apparently superfluous vein—and has thus mastered and can explain the whole arrangement—we shall still encounter infinite perplexities, and the study of Plato will continue what it always hitherto has been, and what Plato himself mainly intended them to be, a mystery to

* *Theætetus*.

exercise thought, and to elicit sparks of right feeling from the reader, rather than a channel for pouring into his mind a whole train of ready made speculations.

Far as we are at present from possessing, even in the profoundest critics of Germany, any such guide to his works, any resuscitated Socrates, we evidently enjoy more insight into their true nature than any former age of philosophy; and the reason is, that we are ourselves living in a period corresponding, most remarkably, with the times for which Plato wrote. We are beginning to feel his wants, to be perplexed with his difficulties, to witness the evils and enormities with which he was surrounded; and these are the best interpretations of the course which his thoughts took. They throw light upon the workings of his mind, as the facts foretold in a prophecy best explain the prophecy itself. And this is the clue which we propose to employ.

One,* therefore, of the best preparations which we should recommend to the student is, an accurate and thoughtful examination of a class of works very different from those of Plato in their outward form, but very similar in their aim and spirit, the comedies of Aristophanes, and especially the *Clouds*. Men smile when they hear the anecdote of one of the most venerable Fathers of the Church, who never went to bed without Aristophanes under his pillow. But the noble tone of morals, the elevated taste, the sound political wisdom, the boldness and acuteness of the satire, the grand object which is seen throughout of correcting the follies of the day, and improving the condition of his country, all these are features in Aristophanes, which, however disguised, as they intentionally are, by coarseness and buffoonery, entitle him to the highest respect from every reader of antiquity. He condescended, indeed, to play the part of jester to the Athenian tyrant. But his jests were the vehicles for telling to them the soundest truths. They were never without a far higher aim than to raise a momentary laugh. He was no farce writer, but a deep philosophical politician; grieved and ashamed at the condition of his country, and through the stage, the favourite amusement of Athenians, aiding to carry on the one great common work, which Plato proposed in his dialogues, and in which all the better and nobler spirits of the time seem to have concurred by a confederacy—the reformation of an atrocious democracy. There is as much system in the comedies of Aristophanes as in the dialogues of Plato. Every part of a vitiated public mind is exposed in its turn. Its demagogues in the *Knights*, its courts of justice in the

* On looking back, since this was written, to Mr. Mitchell's Preface to the *Clouds* of Aristophanes, we have been struck with the similarity of his views in many points; and the value of his very eloquent sketches in illustrating the times of Aristophanes. But we must beg leave to protest against his criticism on Socrates and Plato.

Wasps, its foreign policy in the *Acharnians*, its tyranny over the allies in the *Birds*, the state of female society in the *Lysistrata* and *Ecclesiazusæ*, and its corrupt taste in the *Frogs*. No one play is without its definite object: and the state of national education, as the greatest cause of all, is laid open in the *Clouds*. Whatever light is thrown, by that admirable play, upon the character of Socrates, and the position which he occupies in the Platonic Dialogues—a point, we may remark, on which the greatest mistakes are daily made—it is chiefly valuable as exhibiting, in a short but very complete analysis, and by a number of very fine Rembrand-like strokes, not ~~any~~ of which must be overlooked, all the features of that frightful school of sophistry, which at that time was engaged systematically in corrupting the Athenian youths, and against which the whole battery of Plato was pointedly directed.

The existence of such a school is no longer, in this age, a matter of history. It is rising up again among ourselves, and though it has not yet attained its full deformity, unless we are warned in time, no wise man will venture to say to what lengths it may finally proceed.

It originated, like all other corruptions of human reason, in two distinct sources. It had two parents, one an error of the head, and the other a perversion of the heart. Neither of these by itself will ever propagate a very extensive mischief; for dry speculations will not spread without some passion to inflame them; and passion by itself, unless apparently countenanced by reason, will appear too gross to be imitated or avowed. It is the same in our daily vices; and an evil wish never takes its start till it is propped on some sophistical excuse.

It is to be observed also, that in the formation of all such schools, the error and the vice (vice, that is, in the language of the world) generally exist in distinct parties. The leaders are often moral men. The followers only ~~are~~ thoroughly depraved. Of Protagoras, for instance, Plato always speaks with some degree of respect; Epicurus was by no means a profligate; Hobbes was a man of decent regularity of life; Locke was never accused of any of those crimes to which his theories led in the French revolution; Paley, with one exception, does not seem to have been palpably corrupted by his miserable doctrines of expediency; and we never heard that either Bentham or Bowring had fallen into the hands of the police. The fact is well worth attention. It may guard us against tolerating errors, because they are not yet ripened into crimes. And it is a proof of the homage paid to virtue, that the absence of glaring vice is necessary for all exercise of authority.

The head of this sophistical monster was thus formed of minds cool, penetrating, and commanding, provided with a fair array of

various accomplishments, and aided by a persuasive eloquence. The intellectual error raised as the standard of the party, was *the uncertainty of knowledge*. But it branched out into a multitude of others, which may easily be anticipated; and far from being primary itself, it was a consequence of a whole train of falsehoods, lying hid in a disordered imagination. Its conclusions are easily deduced. And we have only to take up a newspaper, or look over a debate in parliament, to find abundant illustration of the practical logic which forced this metaphysical principle through all the veins and channels of Athenian life, private or public. The argument ran thus: if there is no certainty in the individual, there is to him no truth,—if no truth, no falsehood,—if neither truth nor falsehood, neither also is there right or wrong, which are but intellectual perceptions of agreement or disagreement with some fixed standard of law. Therefore there is no law external to our own feelings. Our own feelings imperatively bid us pursue pleasure and avoid pain. Pleasure and pain, therefore, are the only rule of moral action, and the criterion of goodness.

It was here that the deep current of abstract thought burst out at once into day in a most marvellously intelligible form. It was like some apt musician passing from the dead dull labyrinths of scientific discords to an old familiar strain; and no sooner was it caught by all the unclean beasts of human kind, that lay battenning in a stupid sensuality, than, to use the illustration of Plato, they pricked up their ears,* flourished their tails, and pranced off, over land and sea, after the metaphysical Orpheus, until he led them to the darling abode of intellect and vice, the democracy of Athens.

Never was a field so well prepared for the reception of such a crew. On the one hand, a rising generation, full of genius, passion, and imagination—in their infancy brought up in a barem amidst women with no pretensions to the dignity of wives or mothers†—in their boyhood managed by slaves, and left destitute of any instruction but a little music, a little grammar, and the exercises of the gymnasium‡—and in their youth let loose into the forum to listen to the profligate lessons of the demagogues of the day, and to have all truth and conscience obliterated amidst the whirl of a daily revolution. Living, as we do at this day, with security for the permanence of moral principles in the permanence of the Church, and amidst at least the forms of old established laws, we can scarcely realize to ourselves the frightful

* Protagoras.

† See the *Lysistrata* and *Eccles.* passim; and compare them with the account given by Dr. Clarke of the interior of a Turkish seraglio.

‡ Alcibiades, 1, Theages, Amatores.

vortex of things and opinions which surrounded the young men of Athens. The council ruled by the will of a mob, the assembly swayed by every breath of passion, as the revengeful or the ludicrous prevailed—its orators boldly casting off every restraint upon human will, and not a voice that dared to wrestle with the popular frenzy, except by appealing to their interest—the courts of justice loosed from all the restrictions of statutes, and banishing or pardoning, fining, and poisoning, at the whim of the moment—no private property safe for a day from the extortions of the public—sycophants and informers on all sides ready to seize on the most innocent, unless bribed to give them a respite—the favourite of the day becoming the exile of to-morrow—men rising suddenly from the dregs of the people to the lordship of the Athenian empire—generals sent out to protect allies, returning all at once enriched with their plunder—whole cities swept away by the hand of public executioners, or removed bodily from place to place;—now a war to devastate their borders, and brought into their very homes by the jealousy and hostility of their slaves—then a pestilence bursting from heaven on all alike, and confounding all sentiment of religion, by its indiscriminate destruction—then a political convulsion, ejecting a whole class of the population, or ripe with assassination and massacre, and pillage; and in the midst of this frightful tumult, sufficient to bewilder and confound the strongest mind, no voice from laws, or teachers, or parents, or priests, to speak of a test of truth or rule of conscience, or order of nature on which their heart might rest, and find something like a shelter from the whirlwind.* Even religion aided the corruption, and scarcely a crime could be named which did not find its sanction in the theology of Hesiod or Homer.†

“Think,” says Plato, in a long and noble passage in the 6th book of the Republic, p. 219,—“Think of the many causes of destruction that now await even those few gifted minds which nature so rarely produces. Think not of sophists by profession, who are said to corrupt and deprave them, but of a people of sophists—a whole nation gathering themselves together in assemblies, and courts, and theatres, and camps, and there clamouring out their censure or their applause till the very walls and the rocks re-echo. Think what, in such a tumult of wild and senseless tongues, young men must feel, and ask if any discipline, any lessons of his home can resist the outcry, and save him from being deluged with the uproar and swept away headlong down the torrent. Look at the dealing of the people with those who refuse to follow them. They confiscate, they disgrace, they put to death—and how can any reasoning resist these fearful influences? Be assured,” he adds again and again, “there is not, and never has been, and never will be in the midst of such an education *a mind that can be raised to virtue—except it be more*

* Repub. b. 6.

† Laws, p. 360.

than human. Be assured, that if a single soul in the present constitution of our states be saved, and become what it should be, it must be by a miracle from God. They hear the public voice speaking the same language with the sophists, preaching the same doctrines, calling the same things wisdom: just as if a man had a monster that he fed, and had learned its temper and its lusts, and how he might approach it safely, how stroke it down, what would tame and what would make it furious, the sounds which it is used to utter, and those which will soothe or exasperate it; and having learned all this by living with the beast and studying its habits, he should call it wisdom, and form it into an art, and proceed to teach it—knowing nothing of these notions or these lusts, which are noble and which are mean—which good and which evil—which just and which unjust, but naming every thing after the fancies of the monster brute; what it liked calling good, and what it disliked, evil. Then turn,” he proceeds, “to the very advantages which nature may have given to a high minded, favoured young man—talent and courage and taste, and strength and fortune. Will not even these cause his ruin, when he sees the whole empire of Greece placed within his grasp, even the barbarians exposed to him—and his heart swells and his fancy is puffed up, and when those who love him best would admonish him of the care of his soul; others, who scorn such a thought, spur him on in the race of ambition, and strain every nerve to drag him from the influence which would save him from destruction.”

This is but a wretched abridgment of a passage which, more than any other, lays open the real state of Plato's mind. It is in the original, full of the most noble eloquence, the eloquence of deep simple indignant melancholy, at the spectacle of vice and ruin which lay before him in his degraded country. And it should be studied again and again, to show that the thing uppermost in his thoughts, was the condition of the young men of Athens, and a last desperate struggle to save, if it were possible, a few.

One part of the quotation has anticipated a remark of no little importance in explaining the influence which the sophist possessed over the minds of the young. Ignorant and uninstructed as they were, they were yet placed within reach of the most tempting prizes which could stimulate covetousness or ambition. The place of popular orator was open to all, and the popular orator of a democracy is for the time its lord and master. To become a Pericles, a Cleon or an Alcibiades, with the mob of Athens and the treasury of its allies at their command, and all the dreams of power, which Athens cherished capable of realization for the aggrandisement of its leaders, was within the reach of every citizen. One thing only was wanting—Oratory. There were no books, which speak to men in their more sober and thoughtful hours; no fixed laws to supersede new daily appeals to the popular will; no prescriptive authority of rank, or natural reverence for virtue; things which in other constitutions render eloquence superfluous,

or counteract its mischief. Without oratory no influence could be obtained.

In this state of things the sophists made their appearance. Gorgias, with his wordy, florid, pantological tautologies, to take captive an Athenian House of Lords; Protagoras, with his political economy, and expediency morals; Hippias,* loaded with an encyclopedia of physical science and useful knowledge; Prodicus, the Horne Tooke of Greece, with an etymological hair-splitting power of purism, at which the careless colloquialist of Athens looked on with wonder; together with Polus, and a host of other strangers who form the back-ground of the singular groupe which is sketched in the beginning of the Protagoras. The whole stage decoration of that dialogue is worthy of great attention. Socrates is awakened in the morning before it is light, by a young friend, who finds his way into his bed-room in breathless haste, to announce the happy news that Protagoras is arrived at Athens. They proceed both to the house of Callias, a sort of Athenian Holland House, where the sophists in great numbers are supposed to be lodged. On being admitted with some difficulty, after a parley with a surley porter, wearied out with the succession of visitors to the newly arrived prodigies—

“We found,” says Socrates, “Protagoras walking in the vestibule. Walking with him in a line on one side were Callias and his brother, and Charmides—all of them men of the first rank: on the other Xanthippus, the son of Pericles, and Philippides and Antimænus, one of the most promising of Protagoras’s disciples, and who intended to become a professor himself. Behind and listening to all that passed were a number of others, chiefly strangers, specimens of the herd who were mentioned before as charmed by this Orpheus of metaphysics, and following

* We are afraid that Hippias would have put to shame the most encyclopedistic Penny Magazine sophists of the present day.

“Tell me,” says Socrates to him, “is this not the case in every science. I ask you, as an universal knowledge man, as one who knows every art and every science, as I heard you boasting the other day in the market-place. You stated that you went to the Olympic games with every thing about you, the work of your own hand,—your ring cut by yourself, a seal engraved by yourself, a smelling bottle and oil-cruise made with your own hands. You had tanned your own shoes, woven your own shirts, spun your own cloak, and even your Persian girdle was your own embroidery. Besides this, you came loaded with poems, epic poems, and tragedies, and dithyrambs, and a whole catalogue of speeches and novels, all your own. You professed yourself also a thorough master of all other arts and professions, especially of rhythm and harmonics, and orthography; and many other things beside, as I well remember. I had nearly forgotten your art of memory, the most brilliant of all your accomplishments.” —*Hippias*, 324.

We trust that such a prodigy of well-bestowed intellect and labour will stimulate this still sluggish age, and that even now we may live to see the woolsack occupied by a chancellor, further advanced in the pursuit of useful knowledge than any who have yet preceded him, who shall sit there not only as the maker of his own law, but the mender of his own stockings, and curler of his own wig.

the sound of his voice from city to city. At the sight of this band of attendants, I was delighted," says Socrates, "to observe how carefully they avoided getting into the way of Protagoras. Whenever he turned and his party, the disciples fell back and divided themselves, wheeling off to the right and left in admirable order, and scrupulously arranging themselves behind him. After Protagoras I observed Hippias of Elis, sitting in the opposite vestibule on a sort of throne, and around him about the steps were sitting Eryximachus and Andion, and a number of others, who appeared to be putting questions to Hippias on astronomy and physical science; while he, sitting aloft on his throne, dispensed to them their several answers. Prodicus was also there in a little room which was formerly used as a butler's pantry, but now from the influx of guests, Callias had been obliged to empty it and turn it into a bedroom. He was lying there in bed wrapped in a quantity of sheep-skins and blankets. On sofas near sat Pausanias and Agathon, the two Adimantus', and some others. But what they were talking of I was unable to catch, notwithstanding all my anxiety to hear Prodicus—for he seems to me a man of universal knowledge, and more than human; but from the gruffness of his voice there was such a buzzing in the room that I could not distinguish what he said."

Then follows his introduction to Protagoras, and an account from Protagoras himself of the profession and character of a Sophist.

No little mistake has been caused by giving to this word itself a wrong etymological signification. It neither means, as Dr. Bowring supposes, who, knowing nothing of Greek, has pronounced Aristotle and Plato to be fools—the wisest of men—still less what is denoted by the term in English, artful and illogical reasoners. The sophists were the persons who professed to *make others wise*; they were the great instructors, the London University, the Useful Knowledge Club, the National Education Society of Athens. Undoubtedly the office they assumed implied their own personal wisdom; and the necessity of maintaining appearances without any real stock of knowledge, coupled with the principle of pleasing without any regard to truth, seduced them into those habits of ingenious trickery, which have since been known by their name. But as Protagoras himself states, it was as the original introducers of a wholly new scheme of education that they took their stand, made their money, and incurred, in no few instances, the odium of political innovators. In this light they were regarded by Plato.

Nothing could be more tempting than the condition of the youth of Athens, for clever conceited, ambitious men, by their own theory disencumbered of a conscience, and obliged by a sense of duty to provide for their own indulgences, to undertake the task of fitting them for those public duties of life, which in a Grecian democracy occupied the whole field of action. And rhetoric, as

the main engine of political eminence, they were thoroughly capable of teaching. The habit of disputation, which sent Hippias every year* to the Olympic games to challenge a run upon his pantological budget, and to improvise on all possible questions, just as scholasticism in the middle ages sent scholars up and down Europe to post their themes and syllogisms at the gates of universities, had given them a thorough command, not over language alone, but over all the arts of concealing ignorance, and misleading weakness, which were necessary to a popular demagogue. Language as the instrument of power over minds—language as the imperfect medium of communicating ideas, and, therefore, the readiest means of mixing and embezzling them in the transfer—language as the art of pleasing—language as the never-failing subject for etymological ingenuity to anatomize—language, again, as the natural transcript of the human mind, and the human mind in that low vulgar form, in which alone a popular leader or an expediency-philosopher can see it, or wish to see it—language in all these lights was to the sophists every thing. It was their stock in trade—the nostrum they offered for sale, the ready unblushing witness to all their paradoxes; the forms through which these moral magnetisers manipulated their somnolent victims; the gaudy tinsel stage which was to attract to the raree show within, the hand-bill of the mountebank, and the apparatus for his thimble-rig. Hence the prominence given in so many of Plato's dialogues to the subject of language,—and especially the invariable connexion between the practical abuse of rhetoric and metaphysical discussions on the nature of pleasure and of truth. This also is the key to the *Cratylus*—a dialogue which, by the most singular misconception, has been searched by Greek critics for etymologies, but which is a serious extravaganza to expose the Horne-Tookism of the day, and its connexion with the metaphysics of sophistry.

The advantages held out to the teachers of this new art of politics were not few. Courted, admired, and pampered by the rich; stared at, at an awful distance, by the poor; their levees thronged with daily votaries; their names wafted from city to city;—crowds gathering round them in all places of public resort, to witness their skill in disputation, and applaud the triumph; the day filled up with the excitement of the contest, or the enjoyment of victory, and business suspended during their presence, as in England at the announcement of a sparring-match or cock-fight†—they yet reaped still more solid advantages from these labours in the diffusion of useful knowledge.

Unlike the great philosophers of ancient Greece, the modern sophists did not disdain to receive a compensation for their

* Hippias.

† Apply *Clouds*, the *Two Logics*.

labours. They were anxious to disseminate learning, and to found for it an itinerant college, but like their modern successors, they still had an eye to the dividends. "Think," says Hippias to Socrates,* "of the sums of money which Protagoras and Prodicus collected from Greece. If you knew how much I had made myself, you would well be surprised. From one town, and that a very small one, I carried off more than 150 minæ, which I took home, and gave to my father, to the extreme astonishment of himself and my townsmen. In fact I think that I have cleared as a sophist more than any two others put together."

To this solid advantage was added no little political consideration in their respective cities. Nearly all the most eminent sophists are found as ambassadors at Athens, and in that capacity they took the opportunity of delivering their lectures. The influence also which they exerted on the people was a fresh source of power and profit. And still other opportunities there were of indulging baser passions than ambition, on which it is impossible to dwell. They lie before us indeed in hideous deformity in every page of Grecian history. But we must cover them up and pass on; only, painful as the task is, bearing them in mind, when we would understand the frightful struggle in which Plato was engaged, and no more joining in the clamour against his noble and pure mind, than we would charge with the crime of murder the finder and helper of a murdered man, because he had blood upon his clothes.

Such were some of the circumstances under which the new system of national education was introduced into Athens. The consequences were such as might be expected. Take away truth from the mind of man, and external law from his conscience, and abandon him in the midst of temptation, and encouraged by the only persons he respects, to the opinion and passion of the hour, and we know what follows. Give then by a natural constitution extraordinary activity to his intellect, and violence to his passions, and you make a monster. And the picture drawn in the *Clouds* of the metamorphosis effected by a Sophist in the character of a young, high-spirited, thoughtless Athenian, falls very little short of one. Instead of music, gymnastics, field-sports and religious ceremonies, his time was now occupied in captious quibbling, bad metaphysics, or bombastic rhetoric. His open-heartedness was changed into cunning—his simple affectionate feeling hardened into entire abandonment even of filial duty, and not rarely into parricide. Human nature was degraded to a level with the brute, and a system of morals founded on the analogy of their instincts. His unreflecting reverence for

* Hippias Major, p. 78.

the gods was laid aside for atheism, or* a theology which made the Divine Being himself susceptible of bribery, or an accomplice in his crimes. His obedience to the laws of his country was cast to the winds; and his country looked on only as a prize for the most crafty plotters, and society as a state of war,† in which might was the only rule of right, and to become a tyrant the supreme happiness of man. The simple unsophisticated instincts of right and wrong were obliterated in the coarsest shamelessness. The very language of morals was confounded, till honesty was called folly, and goodnature weakness, and cunning wisdom, and he was thought wisest and best who could impose most cleverly on others, whether by word or deed, by falsehood or assassination, by solemn promises, or still more solemn perjuries.‡ Even the boon which nature showered so profusely on the Greek races, personal beauty and strength, was lost in the general ruin; and instead of the open walk, the manly figure, and countenance flushed with health and ingenuous modesty, the eye fell on every side upon paleness, emaciation, and effeminacy and deformity, betraying the wreck of the mind within.

Those who are familiar with the comedies of Athens, its orators and its historians, will not accuse this sketch of any exaggeration. It is not a picture of what might follow, but of what had followed in the time of Plato. And upon this spectacle he was looking when he wrote his Dialogues. And let us pause for one moment to reflect on the feelings with which he must have regarded it. We will not indeed elevate the character of Plato to a level with that of Pythagoras, so far as existing records enable us to judge. He had not the boldness or decision of character to organize an extensive confederacy, and thus obtain the command of the political movements of his country. There is a want of energy about his measures—a reasoning, didactic, speculative tone of mind which would fit him for writing in the closet far better than for acting in the assembly. His indignation, strong as it is, permits him still the use of irony, and irony rarely co-exists with the highest intensity of feeling. He seems to play and dally with human nature, as a timid physician trifles with palliatives, instead of crushing it in the full blossom of its sins with a hand of iron. Even the elaborate polish of his words, the art with which every stone is fitted into its proper place, indicate a thoughtfulness and design, and a thoughtfulness slightly diverted from a practical object to a speculative production, which is scarcely consistent with the vehemence of a bold energetic reformer.§

* *Laws*, x. † See the theory well drawn out in the preface to Hobbe's *de Cive*.

‡ *Thucydides*, lib. 5.

§ Plato lived till 80 years of age, and according to *Dionysius of Halicarnassus*, he

They are not like the passionate outbursts—the rapid, vivid sparks showered off by a gigantic hand welding, blow upon blow, a red-hot mass of human corruption. If Luther, instead of popular tracts, rough, coarse, but full of fire, which kindled the populace in a moment, and engaged even the printers in a conspiracy to publish them with scrupulous accuracy, while they filled the answers of the Romanists with the absurdest blunders; if he had sat down in his closet, and left Platonic dialogues as a legacy to the world, or like Erasmus had written praises of folly, the Papacy, as far as he was concerned, would have been in vigour to this day. It is passion, and not intellect, which effects revolutions. And the most perfectly finished works of literature tell least at a time of excitement. They keep the light burning for future generations, but do not diffuse it at the moment.

When we add to this natural bias of Plato's mind, the catastrophe of the Pythagorean schools, the murder of Socrates, the jealous passions of the Athenian tyrant, and perhaps the hopelessness of the case, we may be prepared for that, which undoubtedly occurs in his writings, more of a lamenting melancholy tone, more of sarcasm, contempt, and remonstrance, than of that intense indignation and energy which we might expect from the purity of his heart. And yet his feeling cannot be mistaken. Read the sixth book of the Republic, the end of the Convivium, the Alcibiades, the Lysis, the beginning of the Theætetus, and especially the whole of the Phædrus, and every line is full of the deepest compassion and sympathy. Not a dialogue but young men are introduced as the persons to be taught, or corrected, or encouraged. Education is the first thought throughout, and the sophist, their deadly enemy, to be expelled from his rule over their hearts. From Socrates, lying at noon-day under the plane tree on the banks of the Ilyssus, and raising up the thoughts of the corrupted Phædrus to another world above him, to the same Socrates sitting in the dungeon, with his hand playing with the hair of Phædo before he entered on that world himself, it is still the friend and guide and moral father of the young, not a mere eloquent poet or speculative philosopher, that is foremost in the pictures of Plato.

And let us learn the feelings with which he regarded them from himself, and not from others. Neither bad-hearted nor cold-hearted men can understand the depth and holiness and

was engaged to the very last moment in "*combing and curling, and weaving and unweaving his writings after a variety of fashions.*" *Κτυλίζων καὶ βοτρυχίζων καὶ πάντα τρέπων αναπλάων.* After his death there was found a tablet, in which the few first words of the Republic were varied and arranged in a number of forms. *κατέβην χθὲς ἰς Πυραῖα μετὰ Γλάυκωνος τῷ Ἀρίστωνος.* Dionys. Halicar. *περὶ Συναθ. 25. p. 242.* The same anecdote is related by Quintilian, Demetrius Phalereus, and Diogenes Laertius.

power of that affection which God himself inspires in the best of hearts, for young souls placed within their reach to be reared up in goodness and truth. Their weakness and tenderness and blindness to the peril that surround them—their warmth of feeling unchilled as yet by the cold hand of a selfish world—the trustfulness with which they surrender themselves to the guidance of others who know themselves to be fallible and frail—their unsuspecting earnestness, their energy and spirit, their open candour and joyousness of heart, hopes which we sigh to think are vain, and fears at whose simplicity we smile—these and many, many lineaments of a nature originally divine, not yet worn out by sin, but bearing still upon them faint gleams of a light from heaven, which fade and die away too often as they descend into the world; even that which nature intended to be the symbol of the soul within, the eye full of openness and joy, the brow unfurrowed with care, the cheek still alive to shame, the frame erect in manliness and vigorous for the duties of life—all these are not placed before us by Him who formed our heart, as things to be looked on with apathy and coldness, or suffered to be crushed and trodden on as we trample on the flower of the field. Give to such beings moreover great powers of good or evil—wealth, talent or rank, on which the fate of thousands may depend, and their own souls go down to the grave, covered, according to their deeds, with the blessings or curses of mankind; and a young man becomes to any thoughtful mind not merely an object of interest, but a spectacle of awe. Not merely the length of one life, but the eternity of many souls, is involved in the acts of his earliest days; and there is One engaging him in a game of which he knows and can know nothing with this frightful stake depending upon its issue. But add to this the thought (we use the language of Plato, not language borrowed from Christianity), that all which is beautiful in nature came from God, and is a type of God, and was seen by him at the beginning to be good, and was showered in profusion upon earth that it might rejoice our hearts, and bind us to his works and to each other, and lead up our affections through the shades and imagery of a glorious creation to a still higher world above us, and to Him who is its Maker and King. Remember that men are not as stocks and stones, but living souls bound to each other by one common origin, engaged in one common struggle to rise up from the dungeon of this life, and the slavery of passion, into a pure and holy region, where they may see God face to face—that in this race they are companions of angels—when they fall, falling together, and when they rise, rising together—that they bring into this world together spirits written over with the truths and hieroglyphs

phics of a nobler state of being, and pass from it to retain beyond the grave the affections and communion cherished here. Think how affections at our birth are wrapped up in the inmost recesses of our nature, not to be stifled and killed, but to be called out, and expanded and consecrated each on its proper object*—that minds and not matter are those objects—that these affections are the springs to all noble actions, the cement of social life, the sweetener of our sorrows, the heightener of our joys, the restorer of energy, and hope even to the dying spirit—that no man ever lived as a saint who was not full of the sympathies of his nature, nor died as a hero without some one, either friend, or home, or country,† for whom to shed his blood. Think of our affections, in one word, as the very “wings of the soul.”‡ raising us up from this dull, dead earth to Him whose name is Love. Then ask by what arm and power we have been saved ourselves from ruin, and raised to heaven, and how we can requite it but by going back and saving others from ruin likewise?§ Remember that here upon earth, and in the heart of man, God has his image; and wherever that image is, there is an object for our love;|| and wherever there is a human soul, there also is a being which we may form and fashion after the model of our God, and become to it its spiritual parent in all holiness, modesty and virtue.¶ And lastly, when a yearning rises up for an existence longer than this short space, even for immortality—remember that one way only is left to obtain it upon earth; if others can be left behind us to whom we have given life, new forms be prepared to take the place of those which must soon decay, and an eternal inheritance of virtue be thus propagated from soul to soul.** Bear all this in mind, and then we should say to a young man, you may approach in innocency and elevation of heart, even to those seeming mysteries of Plato, the oft-recurring questions of human affection, which, (mixed up as they are in concession, as he himself declares,†† to the necessities of the age,) with much to make us tremble, are nevertheless in substance holiness and purity itself. We know how holiest things in holiest places, even in God’s own word, have been profaned by man’s impurity. Let us not commit the same sin on the memory of the wisest of heathens; or wantonly defile a spring from which the best of men have drank goodness, health and strength, and lifted up their heads for a battle with their passions, and a triumph.

And these thoughts, so like what Christianity consecrates by blending them with the most solemn of its mysteries, and the consummation of its perfection, were in Plato not mere metaphy-

* Phædrus.

|| Phædrus.

† Laws.

¶ Republic

‡ Phædrus.

** Convivium.

§ Republic.

†† Phædrus.

sics. They formed a necessary part of his practical system. All philosophies whatever may be divided into two heads, those which contemplate things and those which establish relations with persons. This is the leading distinction. And Platonism, like all other sound and noble theories, was in a peculiar degree a philosophy of persons. The heart occupied its natural place in the structure of humanity. Feelings and affections were encouraged as well as ideas arranged. A spiritual world on all sides was seen behind the veil of a material world, and to this the affections passed on and there rested in their natural objects. To have left out the theory of the affections, or not given it a most prominent place, would have belied the whole character of Plato's mind. It was necessary for many other reasons. If men's hearts were to be raised and purified, and tuned to higher energies, this could only be effected by appealing to the common sympathies of their nature. Cold, lifeless reason, could do nothing. If the corrupting influence of the sophistical school was to be met and overcome, it was necessary to rouse up an antagonist power in good and pure emotions, to take affections which nature has firmly rooted in the best of minds, and train them to right objects instead of permitting them to run wild, or endeavouring to extirpate them wholly. There is a beautiful sermon of Dr. Chalmers' on this important law of moral education. If the evil spirit is to be driven out, do not leave its old abode empty and garnished for a time, but fill it at once with a good spirit, ready to keep and defend it. And this was never forgotten by Plato.

Once more, as an educational system, his philosophy could no more move without the spring of affectionate feeling, than a locomotive engine, with all its wheels and boilers, can start if you put out the fire. Let not men suppose, as they do suppose in the present day, that you can educate by steam; that acts of parliament, and joint stock companies, and meetings at Exeter Hall, and Commissions of inquiry, and mechanics' institutes, and Lancastrian schools, and doses of useful knowledge, diluted to the meanest capacities, and patchwork of Scripture stitched together, that the child may not know whence it comes; that all this bustle of cosmopolitan dreamers and political mountebanks can train up a single child in the way in which he should go. There must be affection, strong, natural, unconscious affection—and affection as He intended—the *one* all-comprehending Being, who has appointed for us each, in his wisdom, but *one* Father, *one* friend, *one* wife, *one* master, bound us to *one* country, sanctioned but *one* king, permitted to us but *one* Church—as he himself has taught us, affection, concentrated in *one* object. Draw up before a child, or a young man, the whole portentous array of an educational police, teachers and subteachers, commissioners and committees,

Houses of Parliament and Convocations of Preachers, and the child will turn away in terror, and run to hide itself in the bosom of its mother; and the young man will laugh in his sleeve, and go off to consult a companion no wiser than himself, if what they have told him is true. There is no certain access to the head except through the heart; and no access to the heart except through the authority of individuals. Even the Church cannot make herself visible, or secure her right place upon men's minds except in the person of her ministers. And as nature has given to the young, affections which thus look up and fix themselves on some one personification of an excellence superior to their own, so she has also provided for them, from their earliest years, a number of such objects around them; and accident or rather Providence for the most part, rarely a predetermined arrangement on the part of man, decides the particular point to which they are carried and adhere. You cannot arrange men, least of all young men, and drill them into processional order, and bind them together as friends, by a will of your own. Affection is spontaneous, and defies compulsion, and takes fright at interference. So that all which an extensive system of corporate education can do, is to remove out of the way all wrong objects, supply as many good as possible, leave the heart to its own natural play, and wait the result. And such were Plato's views. His great fundamental scheme piercing through every subject and fully developed in his Republic, is a polity for the education of man, just as the Church is a polity, so far as mere human nature is concerned, constructed for the education of Christians.* It was to have laws, superintendents and teachers. But Plato no more thought of practically working his system and conveying his lessons to the heart, through his central committee of phylaces, or any subordinate functionaries, than he would have proposed to teach loyalty to a nation by garrisoning their towns, or honesty to the thieves of London by an establishment of police. He secured stability by such a plan in the maxims of education. He gave support and authority to individual influence. He regulated movements, and removed obstacles, and insured a supply of virtue, but the particular channels through which that supply was to flow, he left to the instincts of nature, and accidental combinations of society. He left it, as we must leave it, with all our parade of machinery, to the voluntary zeal, or the unintentional infection of individuals—to that moral influence of example and personal attachment, which can neither be forced by acts of parliament, nor ensured by endowments, nor remunerated by salaries, but without which the whole system of education, however orderly and beautifully branched out by its contriver, is but a dead tree, and will bear no fruit. We know how

* Repub. 5, 7.

this spirit is engendered and fostered by Christianity. The very facts of Christianity supply it. But Plato had no such facts. He wished that every old man in the state might look on every young man as his child,* but to obtain the groundwork for this feeling he was obliged to imagine (imagine only, for he never proposed to realize) a state of things which might give to all a community of interest and life, such as the Church literally fulfils in the spiritual world. He felt, as Christianity feels, the difficulty of the problem—how with man's tendency and duty absorbed in the contemplation of perfection;* his eye may be forced downward and his affections engaged in an inferior object. And he used the same arguments with Christianity, that such a task is a duty devolved on us by the will of the great Legislator of the world; that the society which reared us from our infancy demands this requital at our hand;* that we are to look to the good of the whole, and not allow selfish enjoyment to interfere with the general interests. But Plato knew how little such reasonings would tell, without some feeling to carry them to the heart. And therefore, like Christianity itself, he permitted particular attachments and indulged and encouraged that universal instinct of paternal affection which, in the words of Clement,† makes all who teach as fathers, and all who are taught as children; and never allows a good man a single superiority over others, without compelling him to use it as means of raising them to a level with himself, and finding his highest enjoyment in the accomplishing the perfection of others. It was this spirit that actuated himself.

“He that speaketh to others through his writings,” says Clement, in another passage, (p. 273,) “is bound as by a solemn oath to God, and registers this vow—not to write for lucre, not for vain glory, not to be vanquished by prejudice, not to be enslaved by fears, not to be elated by pleasure; to think of but one enjoyment, the salvation of those that read. And not even this to think of sharing at the present, but to wait patiently in hope for his reward, from him that hath promised to pay his labourers according to their hire.”

We have been led on this point much farther than we had intended. But it is not a digression. It is absolutely necessary in a preparation for understanding the main features of Plato's philosophy, and especially for approaching the *Phædrus*, with which the study of the system must commence. The analysis which we had proposed to give of that singular dialogue, must be postponed till another time. For there are a few more preliminary remarks which it will be expedient to make, before we conclude for the present.

* *Repub.*

† *Stromat. lib. 1.*

In the first place, returning to the statement which was made respecting the fundamental doctrine of the sophist and its logical conclusions, we may now understand the principle on which Plato arranged his plan of attack. For instance, as the conclusion must follow, if the premise be granted, he never attempted to stem the torrent of mischief anywhere but at its source. Every question of vice and virtue, politics or morals, pleasure or pain, is carried up by him at once to the original ground of dispute, the *certainty of knowledge*. It is treated, and treated most properly, as a question of science, never of mere feeling, still less of expediency. If there is a doubt as to the right or the wrong of an action, we must look for some standard of right. At the very least the discovery of such a standard must be an intellectual process. If none can be obtained, our moral principles are gone. If any can be obtained, we have only to observe it. This accounts also for the perpetual recurrence of the doctrine of ideas (*ὁ θεωλλόμεν*, Phæd.), on which his standard of morals was founded. It accounts also for the unsparing severity with which he cut away from the human mind every thing like fancy, poetry, mere emotion, casual opinions, sensation, and the like. These formed the empire of his adversaries. And until he could take his footing on a sure ground of truth, he was wholly unable to combat with them. Hence it is that the nature of human knowledge, of science and opinion, occupy so large a portion of every work, not as an abstract metaphysical question, but as constituting in fact the very root of the sophistical doctrine, which he was endeavouring to eradicate. His end was not like the German theorists, speculation, but practice. His practice involved his speculation.

This accounts also for the comparative gentleness with which, as we observed before, he deals with the greatest delinquencies, and for which he throws out an early apology in the Phædrus. (p. 60.)

When men can trace faults to errors, and excuse absurdity or vice as ignorance of truth, it is astonishing how their indignation subsides. Want of skill in dialectics is the source to which Plato refers for all the follies and sins of the day. It seems at first sight folly and sin to assign any such misnomer. And Aristotle, and other moralists, who have either purposely perverted, or have misconceived the theory of Plato, make themselves very merry with the thought of thus turning crimes into mistakes. A little consideration would prevent all such thoughtless criticism; and opportunities may occur hereafter of pointing out the real relation in which, according to the view of Plato, and to the facts of human nature, the head must stand to the heart. At present this forgiving spirit is mentioned as an explanation of the studious adaptation of his writings to an undeveloped or perverted, or careless condition of the intellect, of the minuteness with which he

draws out every link in a chain of reasoning, the effort to awaken and retain the attention, the little indulgences of humorous and dramatic action, at times the florid and gorgeous description, all addressed, as he distinctly says in the *Phædrus*, to *Phædrus* himself, that is, to the class of readers of which *Phædrus* was the type—the gifted, profligate, and corrupted youth of Athens.

Still this was not all that was required for the extirpation of the sophistical school. Their fundamental doctrine of the uncertainty of knowledge, branched out, indeed, into these corruptions; but it had also its roots—roots very deeply sunk; and it was very little to lop the boughs, and leave the stock alive, to send forth a fresh succession. To cut this stock out of the ground was the main design of Plato, and perhaps no effort of the human intellect is more astonishing than this to a thoughtful mind, not frivolously ridiculing things which he does not understand, but penetrating into the real thoughts of Plato, and alive to the difficulties of his position.

The origin of the sceptical theory, traced historically, is to be found in physical science; and the origin of physical science is to be found in a stage of society when the principle of faith is abandoned for that of self-will, and men are released from the sense of a moral influence above them, embodied in human authority. It was so in the Ionian school of old, and it was so in the Baconian philosophy. Thales paved the way for Heracitus and Pyrrho, Bacon for Hobbes and Locke, and the Sophists of the present day. And the course of human reason has ran through similar channels, and fallen down the same succession of degradations in the Heathen and the Christian era.

There are but two objects on which men can exercise their reason, mind and matter, or to use a distinction made before, "*persons and things.*" So long as we fix our eyes upon minds, or persons, or spiritual agents within and without us, so long our moral affections come naturally into play, and the moral relations of life will be maintained and obeyed. There will be no question of a law without us, for we shall recognize it in the very existence of every moral agent. For no moral agent can exist without prescribing limits to the actions of others, deserving affections, and reciprocating duties, without therefore being to us *a law*. There will be no question of a law within us, a law of conscience, because the act of self-reflection will exhibit our twofold nature, reason and goodness on the one hand, passion and vice on the other, and the two cannot be placed side by side, without our at once recognizing where lies the imperative authority. The natural superiority of virtue over vice, when virtue and vice are both before us, is as much a necessary perception, as that four are more

than two. When it is not perceived we may be sure the comparison is not made. When we are accustomed thus to believe in and to act up to relations with other moral beings within our own experience, we shall be very docile, even very credulous when we are told by them of other moral beings out of sight. Religion will become part of our nature. It will be only an expansion towards God of feelings already existing towards man. Upon this moral vision, joined to the consciousness of our own infirmities, and our instinctive conception of something better than ourselves, we shall build our faith in man, and upon our faith in man we shall rest our belief in God. On this follows our belief of a future state—of rewards and punishments;—of moral responsibility; and all the other views which give definiteness to our choice of actions, and by practically influencing our conduct, do more than all the reason in the world to harden and anneal our fancies and opinions into enduring subjective realities. Fancy paints pictures on the mind, but it is action that burns them in, and hope and fear, pleasure and pain, that kindle the fire.

In this way, wherever there is an abiding sense of spiritual and moral agents surrounding and acting upon us, there we shall find no place for moral scepticism, no ingenious cavillings about the distinctions of right and wrong; and where there is no scepticism in morals, there will be none in any thing else. You may prove to a good man, that the whole of the material creation is, according to Heraclitus, in a perpetual flux. It no more affects him than the decay of a house interests the lodger for the day; it is no part of himself. You may throw doubts upon every sense; but they are quite faithful enough to support life, and it is not with the eye or the ear that he becomes acquainted with moral realities. You may exhibit vacillations and discrepancies in the sentiments of the world; but the world is not the standard to which he appeals; he is quite beyond the reach of any such vicissitudes and convulsions. If he is weak himself, he has strength elsewhere; and as the very notion of a Deity is necessarily that of perfection, his strength cannot be impaired. Nothing can shake him, which does not shake God. From Plato to Descartes, from St. Paul to the humblest Christian, it is still but one simple act of faith. There is a God; God is goodness; goodness will take care of me.* And the ground, the only ground for this belief, and all its consequences, is to be found in an instinctive, a Christian will say a supernatural, power of vision, by which spiritual beings are brought under the eye of our consciences, hidden, as they may be, behind a veil of flesh, or wholly removed from sense. Sight and obedience, obedience and certainty follow

* *Timæus*, *Repub.*, *Phæd.*

together, the moment a Power above, whether by the instinct of a warm, affectionate, trustful, heart, or by the quickening of a dead nature within us, bids us, as Eneas was bade,—

“ Adspice, namque omnem, quæ nunc obducta tuenti
Mortales hebetat visus tibi, et humida circum
Caligat, nubem eripiam : tu ne qua parentis,
Jussa time, neu præceptis parere recusa.”

And then follows the vision of Deity,—

“ Apparent diræ facies, inimicaque Trojæ,
Numina magna Deûm.”—(*Virgil. lib. 2.*)

Now then, reverse the case. Close up this spiritual eye, and thicken the darkness laid upon it, even in its natural state, by a course of vice or frivolity, or the absence of reflection, or conceit, or self-will, or self-indulgence, or contempt for others, or any other passion or folly by which man is shut up into himself, as in a dungeon ; and if his reason is to be employed at all, it will turn naturally, at first, upon the material world. He loses sight of mind, and becomes wholly conversant with matter. The material world, we know as a fact, is but a series of changes. If by an experimental philosophy, such as the present day delights in, we reduce its movements to general laws, and so give it unity, fixedness and eternity, and therefore a semblance of power, we shall undoubtedly run the risk of making it our God. It will possess the main qualities required by the cravings of *human reason* to satisfy its contemplation ; and in the case of which we are speaking, the heart has no place, and reason is every thing. Thus Aristotle's physical science led him as naturally to the eternity of the world, and something approximating to Pantheism, as the same science before our eyes is encouraging the same absurdities, though while the Church maintains her ground, they dare not openly appear. But remove experimental philosophy, as was the case in the Ionian school, and leave men nothing but the perpetual changes before them of outward objects, their fallible senses to watch those changes, and very imperfect metaphysics to explain their physical experiences, with about as much propriety as the price of a chaldron of coals is taken to measure the cost of a ton of hay ; put man in this position, and nothing on earth can save him from the most frightful scepticism. There is nothing uniform without—no order, no law ; nothing stable within—for the nobler spirit of his nature has never been heard speaking with the stern voice of unalterable uncompromising duty. Testimony is suspected because it varies. Human opinions are full of doubt, for virtue alone is one, and vice many. And men, in the eyes of such a sceptic, are nothing but vicious machines,

swayed about by every impact of sense. Religion, of course, there is none; for there is nothing from which to infer it,—no order of nature, where nature is a heap of disorder; no voice of conscience, where a moral being within is unfelt; no authority of tradition, where all testimony is full of suspicion; no moral influence of example, where moral agents are unknown. What is true of physical knowledge and religion, applies equally to morals. And thus the whole of nature is unsettled, and the fabric of man and of society falls in one chaos to the ground.

Such is the connection between the doctrine of Heraclitus, asserting the perpetual flux of matter, and the demoralization of the Sophistical school. And we may be well alarmed at the example, when every day physical science is rising into undue pre-eminence, and withdrawing men's eyes from that moral world which alone can fix our duties and realize our perfection.

It is very true, that at present it is not taking precisely the same line of mischief in which the Ionian school terminated. The uniformity of nature, which has been proved by experimental philosophy, rather engenders dogmatism than doubt at first; but ultimately the result will be the same. This very uniformity, so wonderful, so attractive, and so full of power, will absorb men's minds, and withdraw them from holding communion with the moral world. In this way they will lose sight of the moral world, and, with the moral world, of the only stable ground of positive certainty. For after all, experience is not like intuition. The bond which holds together the series of material changes, is not like the indissoluble union of our moral sentiments: experience may fracture the one, but it cannot touch the other. We can believe that the sun, which rises in the east to-day, may, by an altered law, rise in the west to-morrow; but we cannot believe that goodness will be hateful, or vice be rewarded, or virtue be indifferent to a virtuous being, or disobedience to superior wisdom become a duty, at any time, in any place, under any convulsion of nature. The whole universe of the physical creation may be overturned without any destruction to our real being. Rivers may run backward to their sources, fire descend downward to the earth, the courses of the stars be reversed, the poison of to-day become the food of to-morrow, the very elemental law of all outward things be repealed, and instead of all things following as they have been, what once has been may never be again; but even in this vast ruin, moral truths would still remain unaltered and unalterable, on which a good and holy mind would rest as on a rock,—

“ Si fractus illabatur orbis
Impavidum ferient ruinæ.”

But if man has no such rock, even without such a physical convulsion there is much to shake his belief. There is the *possibility* of changes; the suspicion, and more than suspicion, the common belief of man of disturbances in the order of nature: there is the ignorance of the individual; the multitude of apparent anomalies; the succession of rival theories, rising and falling upon each other, like the sand hills in an hour-glass. And after all we know but little, very little, of the physical world; and our conviction of its immutability is an exercise of faith, not the forced result of experience. We believe that all things will continue in order, because He that made all things is good. Any other reason is, indeed, vain. Remove, therefore, the sense of an overruling Being, by thinking too much of his works; lose sight of the Creator in the creature, and this ground of certainty goes likewise. But then think of that which must come sooner or later, the "*cruz ultima*" of human belief—the weary mind, the aching heart, the sick solitude, the bed of death, those hours when men can no more drown themselves in the intoxication of experiments, —cannot pick roots, or sort flints, or anatomize beetles,—when though the whole physical world were thrown open to us, not all its mysteries together could fill up one corner of a desolated heart, nor all its treasures purchase one drop of cold water for the burning of the tongue; and in those hours, if nothing is left to animate and quiet, but the uniformity of matter, what is to become of man? He may go through life as a piece of machinery, conforming himself to the machinery of nature, and consolidating himself into it as a part, and when he triumphs by succumbing to its laws and cleaves through the water without winds, and flies into the air, though nature has chained him to the ground, and is swept along by a little vapour over raised up mountains of rubbish, and through dark holes fathoms underground; he may stand in the pride of his heart, by the black, panting, steaming, monster which drags him along, and rejoice that, after all, he himself is the *great locomotive* of the world, and that the order of nature is nothing but a tram-road for him to work on. And all this will do very well till the engine blows up, or breaks down, or till he reaches to the end of his journey, cold, comfortless, and solitary—with a night, and a dark night, before him. It will be happy, very happy, for such a man, if nothing worse than a sense of desolation follows upon such an absorption of thought; if even then, when those still in their strength would cheer him by the miracles of art, he only turns, like a weary child, worn out with the wonders of a play, and cries himself to sleep upon the breast of his mother. But if his mother is not there to receive him, the case is, indeed, hopeless, and utter despondency must follow. In one

word, let us not suppose that the passion for physical science is at all less likely now than hitherto to end in a moral scepticism. The end will be one step removed, but that is all. We may think that we have moored our belief to the side of an island, but the moment the fire is lighted we shall find that, like Sinbad, we have cast anchor on the back of a whale.

Many other symptoms might be collected to show, that as a nation we are rapidly losing that power of moral vision, without which a nation perishes. The sophistical doctrine, that every man is the measure of all things, that the feeling of the moment, under the name of conscience, is the only standard of right and wrong; that a numerical majority of voices is not indeed the test of truth, for truth is supposed to be beyond the reach of man, but the guide to be followed both in morals and religion; that the fancy of each individual, as to possible expediency, is to be the rule of political conduct, instead of old written laws, and still older inherited maxims; these, and many other like things, are fatal indications of an approaching plague. In both the great divisions of erring Christianity, the sophistical doctrine is fully developed. In Dissent, indeed, it is openly avowed; in Romanism openly repudiated and secretly followed. In both there is the same departure from external law and Catholic antiquity; only in Dissent every individual is a sophist; in Romanism the whole society collectively in the person of its heads. In like manner our views of education are veering round to the same point with the notions of Hippias and Protagoras. We hear much of a variety of accomplishments, indiscriminately accumulated, and ostentatiously displayed. The same problems regarding education meet us now, as in the days of Plato. Whether it is education or instruction, a discipline for the whole man, or a pouring in of facts into the sieve of his memory; whether it is to be conducted on the old maxims of our forefathers, or new modelled by some Sophist of the day; whether it must be connected with religion, or torn from it; whether truth be a necessary ingredient in it, or practical knowledge only be required; that is, so much knowledge as may serve to fill a man's pocket in the world, as the rhetoric of Gorgias enabled the young Athenian to become the pampered demagogue of Athens. If oral instruction is diminishing, so it was at Athens; if books are multiplying upon us, and books of the most frivolous kind, so it was at Athens; if a shifting and changing of opinion has destroyed all confidence in public men, so it was at Athens; if the infection has been spread from abroad, and smuggled in, like other diseases, through the wares of Germany and France, so it was at Athens. Their sophists were also foreigners. And if their young men were the first to catch the plague, we

may well look to ours. Of those who are safe under the protection and guidance of the Church, it is happily unnecessary to speak; but there is a class elsewhere, and a very numerous and important class, the medical students of the metropolis, who, we fear, would little bear a scrutiny into their condition; and, there is reason to believe, are at this moment falling a prey to one of the worst forms of sophistry, under a recognized teacher of Materialism. We hear much of the slavery of negroes, and the duty of converting the heathen; we trust some Christian mind will soon rouse the attention of the country to this most alarming point in the alarming condition of the metropolis.

It is a painful parallel, which renders the revival, at this moment, of the study of Plato a matter of no little interest to a philosophical observer. It indicates a sense of the evil, though perhaps not of its definite form. It promises subsidiary aid,—so much aid as sound philosophy can give to sound religion,—to the efforts of the Catholic Church, which only can save the country from the same ruin of its people and its liberties, its morals and religion, which befel the Athenians.

We shall conclude with briefly pointing out the means which Plato adopted to destroy the mischief at its roots; and they may not be uninteresting to ourselves in our present very similar condition. He began, then, with destroying the authority of the teachers of this new school. He knew that no doctrines can spread, unsupported by a personal influence; and the influence of ostentatious knowledge, and real powers of intellect, was only to be undermined in three ways,—by exposing the fallacy of their pretensions, and humbling them by ridicule; by exhibiting equal powers, and very similar accomplishments in his own works; and by attracting from them to himself the personal respect and attachment of the young.

Hence, in the first place, the irony, sarcasm, and elenctic character of all his preliminary dialogues, in which sophists are introduced and exposed, before the mind of the reader is transferred to the positive instructions of Plato himself. To give full scope to this design, as well as to embody his reasoning in a dialectical and dramatic form, it was necessary to adopt some character which should unite the powers of ridicule and grave teaching; and blend the comedy and tragedy of philosophy in that dramatic form so congenial to the Athenian taste. The same principle which led to the exhibition of living characters on the stage, pointed to Socrates as the man to represent this part. We know from the faithful, affectionate account of Xenophon, who seems to have written with a view to vindicate the character of his master from the travesties to which he was exposed, that mere human

reason never rose to more pure, elevated, and practical morality, than in the ethics of Socrates. We may be sure, also, both from the *Clouds*, and from Plato, that there were about him many personal peculiarities, oddness of appearance, coarseness at times of illustration, and habits of life, which made him a very fitting subject for this ethical caricature; not a caricature intended to ridicule, but necessary for carrying on a plot, and just sufficiently heightened to excite a smile without destroying the resemblance. We know as a fact, that the *Lysis*, which was published before his death, contains things which by his own declaration he never said. The metaphysical arguments of Plato also are wholly unlike the plain practical ethics, on which the fame of Socrates had rested. Anachronisms, studiously introduced, prove that the dialogues themselves are not narratives of facts, but historical fictions; and the very name given to them by Aristotle, *Σωκρατικοὶ λόγοι*, as ranked with the poetry of the drama, proves that they were works of imagination,—creations, not repetitions. We are therefore not to look in the Socrates of Plato for the real living Socrates. He is rather a more serious personification of the Greek comedy, with its deep solemn truths within it, and a strange face of mockery without; or to use a common illustration, the model of moral beauty encased in a corporeal Silenus. It is remarkable, but in perfect consistency with the object assumed, that all his irony and jesting, the solemn dissimulation of his meaning, the grave, ingenious, ignis-fatuus-like trickery with which he plays on before a poor unsuspecting disputant, and draws him, step after step, into the middle of a quagmire, is reserved wholly for the Sophists. It never enters into a dialogue where young men are the immediate learners, or old men the inquirers after truth. He is always far from personal pretensions; more anxious to stimulate curiosity than to indulge the indolence of learning; but he never displays the slightest approach to a heartless sneering cavilling; nothing but honest unaffected endeavours to bring minds to the knowledge of truth. Nothing can be more grotesque than the writhings of the angry sophist, once entangled in the meshes of Socrate. Sometimes it ends in silence; sometimes in a humbled confession; not unfrequently in charges of unfairness, and no little violence of language.* But the effect is complete,—the sophist exposed, and the spell broken.

To the second object mentioned, that of raising a counter-acting attraction to the brilliant shop-window of the sophist, we must attribute much of the poetical embellishment and elaborate finish of the Platonic writings. The so-often censured floridness of the *Phædrus* is avowedly employed for this purpose. The *Me-*

* *Republ.* b. 1.

nexenus, instead of being, as supposed, a grave panygeric on that Athenian democracy whom Plato never thought of without compassion for the people, and indignation and disgust at their leaders, is an exhibition of popular rhetoric, to show how easily he might excel in a style of rhetorical flattery which he expressly repudiates and disdains. All minute attention to language he censures, both in the *Politician* and the *Laws*; and yet the language of Plato is the very perfection of style. Consider this as a practical effort to win the attention of the young, and every thing is consistent; look on it merely as an exhibition of taste, and it is perfectly unintelligible. On the same principle the recurrence is to be explained of those gorgeous myths, which appear to have been imitated after a practice of Protagoras.*

The foundation of the academy and the plan for perpetuating a school, both projects unknown before at Athens, are indications of the third mode mentioned by which he proposed to counteract the personal influence of the sophists.

His next object was to attack their theory in its vital point, and raise up some solid foundation for a structure of human knowledge, something to resist scepticism, a sort of hurricane house, against the whirl of sensation, opinion, and feeling. For this purpose, and not as a mere hypothetical speculation, he built up his doctrine of Ideas. We hope to enlarge on this more fully on some future occasion; it is sufficient at present to point out its three grand features.

In the first place it asserted the existence of certain fixed forms and shapes in the material world, laws which regulated its movement, types after which its combinations were formed, in opposition to that view of it which considered it as a jumble of atoms, a chaos of shapeless accidents. It gave what the Baconian philosophy gave, under precisely the same name of *forms*, system and order to the visible creation; and a system founded, whether rightly or not, at least in perfect agreement with almost every theory of physical science, on a scheme of classification. In establishing this system as something prior to and distinct from human conceptions, and as fixing limits which human sensation could not pass, it placed over even our sensations an external law, something which modified sense, but which sense could not modify, and which, therefore, is the basis for physical truth—a fixed standard, existing, even if not found, to which we must bring our conceptions of the physical world, and by which they may be tested.

He extended the same assertion to the moral world—declared that by the very constitution of the mind certain notions and feelings

* Protagoras.

were so intimately associated together as to be wholly incapable of separation. For instance, the perception of truth, enjoyment of truth, and desire to attain it; in the same manner, the rightness of justice, its agreeableness to a law within us, its beauty, and a conviction of its expediency—in the same manner particular perceptions following unerringly and universally upon the placing before the mind certain objects in certain connection with each other, in other words, ideas of relation—these formed a second class of the *ideas* or *forms*, or groups and shapes of things, created by nature, stamped upon the soul indelibly, which man cannot break or dissolve, which are wholly beyond his power to change, which never do change, and which we cannot conceive it possible to change, which fix, therefore, an immutable standard and give a foundation and test for moral truth.

Still these were subjective certainties, that is, they were immutable combinations existing in the human mind; and even the eternal forms of the material world, in a certain sense, were subjective, inasmuch as the perception of external objects may be reduced wholly to states of mind, and therefore are ultimately subjective.

But subjective certainty, however strong and universal, does not satisfy the demand of men for necessary unalterable truth. Unless we believe in something above and beyond us, wholly unmoved by our fancies and independent of our sensations, we do not feel that we possess a sure and solid ground for belief. The mind must be anchored somewhere, and that somewhere must be a solid rock, not part of the ship itself. This rock and anchorage for the mind is to the Christian the whole spiritual world, revealed to his sight by Christianity. He never saw this world, has no proof of its existence, no proof that is, which, if he choose to cavil, he may not be able to dispute. We may dispute every thing. But he has been told that it exists, and he believes the tale, because it is *natural* that he *should* believe the statement of others; and his belief holds fast because nothing adequate occurs to make him distrust his informants; he believes upon their testimony. In the same manner Plato proposed to realize to the minds of his hearers an unseen world, a place higher than the dim sight of men, untouched by sublunary changes, prior to the creation of the visible world, in which men's thoughts were to be fixed, and where, when his perfection was accomplished, he was hereafter to dwell. The existence of some such world is a necessary anticipation of man's nature; it forms a part of every mythology and of the creed of the savage. It is not till we have penetrated far into the depths of metaphysics, and thrown such light upon the formation of our ideas, as to reduce all things else

to total darkness, that man dreams of a subjective existence, and a subjective existence only, as true or possible.

But rationalism necessarily leads to this tendency to subjectiveness. It does so in the present day. Men who have lost their perception of other moral beings commanding their belief and engaging their thoughts and affections, if they do not throw themselves upon a world of matter, busy themselves in scrutinizing the nature of themselves. Hence so much of our literature which is not taken up with physical science is made up of a display of feelings, of confessions, and autobiographies, of descriptions of distempered minds, of anatomical preparations of sins and follies put into glass-cases and exhibited by the diseased parties themselves. Every man is thinking of himself; and so it was at Athens. But we have a ground to fall back upon in bringing men back from this miserable state of self-consciousness, which Plato had not. We have the Church; and her existence and her testimony fully and boldly put forward will restore men to their senses. It will rouse them from this moral somnambulism in which they are plunged at present, by the vivid action of an object external to themselves, against which they cannot close their eyes, or, when once seen, withdraw their senses. But Plato was compelled in the first place to go to reason. He could find little in the popular religion, which could be consecrated to such a purpose as the creation before the eye of the mind of an unseen and perfect world. All that he could do was to argue from the visible to the invisible, from the imperfect to the perfect. This world, he reasoned,* is the work of design;† design implies an end, and an end existing before the means by which it is accomplished. This end requires a form or model for the machinery which creates it; therefore, prior to the creation of the world there must have been types and patterns somewhere before the eye of the Creator, after which all things were formed, and up to which, as we find from experience, all our observations of nature lead, because we find its productions classified under certain heads, and reproducing unity of plan, in an infinite variety of shapes. Great, very great obscurity rests upon the objective character of those ideas or examples of the physical creation. But those who study him most, will, we think, recognize most clearly a picture undefined indeed, but brilliant and very real, of a sort of heaven—of locality and relations, and objective reality, which a Christian will not fail to compare with the more positive but not more distinct enunciations of the Scriptures.

But such a heaven, even the heaven of the *Phædo*, the treasure-house of all physical glories, is not enough to satisfy

* *Timæus*.

† *Laws*, B. 10.

the heart. There must be also within it an Informing Spirit, by whom the heavens themselves were made, and in whose eternal immutable nature, anterior to all things and the cause of all things, the germ of the whole universe, spiritual and physical, lay hid before it pleased him to call it into existence,* who made it all for good, shaped it after types of good, impressed his character upon all, and therefore to whose character alone all goodness and all truth must be referred. And Him, the Maker of the world, the King of all flesh and of all spirits; who is to the world of spirits what the sun is to the world of sense, the ruler of its movements and cause of its life;† who gives truth to outward things and faith to the soul that perceives them; who is the source of all power, beauty of all beauties, truth of all truths, law of all laws, goodness of all goodness,—Plato, with that trembling awe with which all good and holy minds fall down in the presence of such a mystery, endeavoured to reveal to his corrupt and blinded age as the last and only hope of saving a few souls from the wreck. How he proposed to realize it to them is the last question to be answered. How does he accord or not with Christianity, on the fundamental problem of the mode in which truth is to be taught and engrafted on the mind of man, whether by authority or by rationalism? The answer is as follows.

That unhesitating, uncompromising grasp of principles, which Plato, as well as Christianity, declared to be necessary not only to human knowledge, but to human action,‡ he endeavoured to confirm in this point, as in others, by a dialectical process which tested every hypothesis advanced by its concordance with acknowledged truth, especially with the order of nature and the moral constitution of man. What faith is in Christianity, science, so far as science implies positive undoubting belief, is to Plato. They are both modes of obtaining absolute subjective certainty. But Plato was compelled to make this belief rest on demonstration; that is, on the seeming agreement of truth with itself; that seeming agreement depending on the constitution of each individual mind, and requiring a logical process wholly beyond the reach of all but the educated few. Christianity demands it as a duty, fixes it by repetition as a habit, demands it upon authority, not on demonstration, upon the testimony of many others, not on the testimony of our own single self; justifies the demand by the weight and vastness of the testimony produced; appeals to man's heart, before his head, and to those affections of the heart which are the soonest developed, and the last to be corrupted,—the trustfulness of a mind conscious of its own weakness, and docile under the guidance of superiors. It thus ensures its possession over the child from his infancy; never leaves him alone in a world of

* *Timæus*.

† *Republic*, b. vi.

‡ *Repub.* *passim*.

doubt without some fixed habitual principles; makes his certainly independent of the perpetual fluctuation of daily opinions without, and of passing fancies and feelings within him; does not exclude demonstration, but never renders it necessary; obtains for him thus a hold over a whole world of truths, which are either beyond the reach of demonstration, or which demonstration could never bring home to his heart; and makes the very act a moral virtue, by requiring in it an exercise of principle which may be entirely wanting in the most perfect conviction of the reason. It gives to the child and the peasant, without any stipulation for those talents which are the rarest gifts of nature, knowledge, which the wisest of heathens vainly sought for; so that in the words even of a French philosopher,* "*à la faveur des lumières qu'elle a communiquées au monde, le peuple même est plus instruit, et plus décidé sur un grand nombre de questions intéressantes que ne l'ont été les sectes des philosophes.*" And without waiting the slow and precarious process of raising the trees of truth from chance and thinly scattered seeds, it covers with them the whole field of human nature, and plants them at once full grown and full of blossom, to bring forth their fruit in due season.

This instrument for implanting knowledge in the human mind, was not within the reach of Plato. His belief was the belief of an individual, worked out to outward eyes by the energies of his own mind. There was no joint voice of an established society, no prejudice of early years, no habitual reverence of office, no connection with an organized system of testimony, preserved as one common deposit in the most remote regions, and transmitted as the inheritance of ages. He stood before those whom he would teach with no power of appealing except to their own reason. And he could recognize no certainty except where that reason approved.† And yet (it is one of the most important features in his system, and one which renders it so applicable to uphold truth in the present day), Plato does recognize the principle of faith wherever he can possibly employ it.

In the first place, on the subject of religion—

"Of the nature of the other deities," he says in the *Timæus*, "to speak or to describe their generation is beyond our power. We must believe those who have spoken to us of them from days of yore—children as they were, and as they called themselves, of the Gods, and knowing well their own forefathers. As children of the Gods we may not dare distrust them, even though the truths they tell us have no correspondences in experience, nor admit of a necessary demonstration. They tell us of things they know, and have heard and seen and felt, and we must obey the law and believe."‡

* Condorcet.

† Theætetus.

‡ The word is still stronger in the Greek, and would suggest many solemn Christian thoughts, *τὰ οἰκία*—things relating to their own home and family.

So also in the education of the young—

“Supposing,” he says in the *Laws* (B. 1) “that you have framed your statutes with even moderate prudence, one of the best and noblest of them all will be this—that you prohibit any young man whatever from inquiring curiously which laws are good and which are bad. And that you all, with one voice and mouth, unanimously proclaim that all alike are good, because the gods established them. If any one speak otherwise, close your ears and do not endure to listen. And if an old man be conscious of a defect in them, let all conversation upon it be confined to the magistrates and the old, and no young man be allowed to overhear it.”

And again, in the *Laws* (B. 2), where he speaks of the departed taking an interest in the affairs of this life.

“The statements which contain these doctrines are true but long. But on all such matters we must trust both to the traditions which relate to them, numerous as they are and of vast antiquity, and trust also to the framers of our laws, unless they teach what is wholly senseless.”

In another passage of the *Laws* he says—

“He that is to take his place amongst the perfectly blest and good, must be partaker of the truth from the very beginning of his life; that all that is possible of life may be spent in enjoyment of truth.”

In other words, truths must be engrafted in the mind of the child long before he is able to understand them; and no dreary blank be left, no previous state of darkness before he is admitted to the light. His eyes are closed at his birth, and we are not to leave him in a dungeon, till he opens them and calls for light, but to pour the light gradually upon them, and couch them at the same time in order to admit it. It is the principle of infant baptism in heathen philosophy.

Such a process as this necessarily requires faith in the child, that he may submit himself to the hands of his instructor, and receive from him unexamined the doctrines which are afterwards to be unfolded. The same principles are indicated by the very form of instruction into which the *Dialogues* of Plato are cast, a form which is constructed on dialectical principles,* and those principles intimately connected with the very foundation of his system. The essential feature in the Platonic dialectics is the intervention of a second person,† to give birth to and shape and test the spontaneous creations of the mind. It might be very possible for a student in his closet to master and apply the whole logical system of Aristotle, using his formularies of argument, and carrying on whole processes of synthetical reasoning, as a child can play the game of patience by himself. But the analytical process of Plato, which insists on arriving at truth by over-

* *Repub.* b. 7.

† *Theætetus*.

throwing preliminary errors, and the principal object of which* is to bring men to a sense of their ignorance before it communicates knowledge; this can no more be carried on by ourselves than any other exercise, the value and interest of which consists in the possible defeat of the performer. It is a game of chess, and cannot be played single-handed.

A more direct enunciation of the principle is contained in the crowning part of the constitution of the Republic—a body of aged men, placed at the head of the state as the depositories of great truths,† and those truths the truths of religion. For whatever be the veil of metaphysics thrown over this part of Plato's writings, cautiously perhaps to avoid the jealousy of the Athenians, we must never forget that philosophy and religion were with Plato indissolubly connected. "Cujus scientiæ," says Lactantius, "summam breviter circumscribo, ut neque religio ulla sine sapientiâ suscipienda sit, nec ulla sine religione probanda sapientia."‡ By them the education of the state is to be conducted; they are to discipline and form a perpetual succession of such teachers, by a long course of experimental instruction, and thus to transmit unimpaired their treasures of original truths, as the very palladium of the state. These are the "guardians and conservators of the society," and such a system could be maintained only by holding together all the parts of the state in a permanent and regular subordination through faith or unlimited confidence in the authority of the instructors.

Even in the personal character of Plato's thoughts, with all his necessary rationalism, there is a constant vein of trustful feeling running throughout—a willingness to receive truth for granted when coming from competent authority—a tendency to cast himself for support upon the guidance, testimony and control of others, looking to their moral superiority as the fit guarantee, rather than to the assent of his own individual reason. It is seen in his constant allusion to those old traditionary streams of ancient revelation, the *παλαιοὶ λόγοι* of his ancestors; in his fond and reverential returns to the mysteries§ and myths of the East; in the stern and authoritative tone with which he supports the dictates of the laws of his country, whether Socrates|| is commanded by them to die, or an hereditary mythology is enforced.¶ If a ceremonial of religion is to be established, it is referred to the oracles of his ancestors. If the real ground is to be stated of his hope of immortality, as distinct from the possible arguments which reason might bring to their support, it is rested on the spontaneous belief, a belief of the heart rather than of the head, that God is

* Protagoras.

† Republic, b. 6.

‡ Lactant. de Falsâ Religione, lib. 1.

§ Phædo, Critias, Phædrus.

|| Crit.

¶ Laws.

good, and, as good, is a rewarder of goodness. But the noblest and most decisive passage is found in the tenth book of the Laws.

“How,” says he, when about to enter on the argument of natural theology, (and we wish those who are giving weight to that theology to see where Plato laid the real foundation of belief)—“how without passion can we reason to prove the existence of God? It must be with bitterness of heart—with hatred and indignation against men, who compel us to engage in such an argument. They who once trusted to the tales, which from their childhood, when lying on the breast, they used to hear from their nurses and their mothers—tales told to soothe or awe them, and repeated like charms above their cradles—who heard them blended at the altar with prayers, and all the pomps and rituals so fair to the eye of a child;—while those same parents were offering up their sacrifices with all solemnity—earnestly and awfully praying for themselves and for their children, and with vows and supplications holding communion with God, as indeed a living God;—who when the sun and the moon arose, and passed again to their settings, heard of and witnessed all around them the kneeling and prostrate forms of Greeks and barbarians alike—all men in all their joys and all their sorrows, clinging as it were to God, not as an empty name, but as their all in all; and never suffering the fancy to intrude that God has no existence;—they who have despised all this—and without one justifying cause compel us now to reason as we do—how can such men expect, that with calm and gentle words we should be able to admonish and to teach them the existence of a God.”

Such is the decision of Plato on the fundamental question in the education of man, the use and importance of authority; not that Aristotle would have answered otherwise,* or any other sect worthy of the name of philosophy. Even the Pyrrhonist recognised authority as the foundation of his unbelief, and by the common consent of mankind endeavour to prove that no such consent could be trusted.† In the same manner the still lower school of Sophistry, which made each man “the measure of all things,” had, notwithstanding, its teachers and pupils, and held out its promises of instruction, with a demand of confidence in their wisdom. And in its most degraded and vitiated form of a Callicles‡ or a Thrasymachus,§ it only transferred the authority from a reason without to a passion within, and still gave up the individual as a slave to a power which impelled him blindly he knew not whither.

Undoubtedly, wherever we turn, this is the question, the question of authority, that meets us, and re-appears in every difficulty which embarrasses either the Church or the country. Every age has some one principle, or, to use a phrase very current in the new speculations of France, “represents an idea of its own,”

* Ethics, b. 1, c. 3.

† See Sect. Empir. passim.

‡ Gorgias.

§ Republic.

which it is the business of the philosophical observer to detect, and of those who are appointed to watch over the minds of men to regulate or expel; and this is the idea of the present day. Our legislation, year after year, is a series of concessions to the people, because no one but the people has a right to pronounce on their own interests or duties. The state is to be desecrated and unchristianized, because no human power may decide between contending opinions in religion. The polity of the Church is set aside, because man must not bend to man, but must be left in independence and solitude to judge of the mysteries of Heaven by the taper-light of his own reason alone, and to worship his Maker as he chooses. Our old schemes of education are to be remodelled to meet the wishes and opinions of those, to correct and control whose opinions all education is appointed. And when a new system is established, as in Ireland, for a whole nation to be won over to the truth, the same fatal *idea* rises up, and, as if by special contrivance, the very notion of authority is extinguished in the minds of the young, by bringing their teachers before them in direct and perpetual collision, on the most solemn of subjects; and by exhibiting in their daily tasks a conflict of difficulties and doubts,* which can end but in an alternative of evils—either absolute unbelief on the one hand, or absolute subjection, on the other, to the boldest assumer of a spiritual despotism. How is it that we have fallen into this gulf? How is it that we have forgotten not only the arguments of reason, but the very first instincts of our hearts, instincts that rise up before our face, at the very moment we attempt to belie them, and which we may misuse and calumniate, but cannot extinguish? We are unsettling the very foundation of Christianity by resting it on the useless support of an unsound natural theology—because we distrust the true basis on which it was placed by its Founder—the authority of its teachers. We are admitting into our philosophical schools, cold, feeble, undigested novelties, to engross and mislead the public mind, if the word *leading* can be applied to an influence, which only retards and embarrasses—because we are ashamed to acknowledge our adherence to the guides of antiquity. We are directing both public measures and private duties, measuring our politics and our ethics by the most false and fatal standard that human ingenuity ever devised, the standard of expediency; cutting off all reference to the past; denying the providence of Him who in making goodness the law of the world, made it also the preservation of the world; stifling our natural affections; annihilating the very essence of virtue; converting the whole of life into a business of calculation, and of calculation without data or end—simply

* See Scripture Lessons of the Irish Education Board.

because we are afraid of walking humbly by the precedents of our forefathers, of taking old lights to guide us in old ways, of trusting to the prejudices of nature, and boldly replying by her voice, as it is echoed by the whole of mankind, to those cavils of a curious casuistry—"why is this right, and this wrong?—why are we pleased, or why are we pained? as if it were not enough to say, that we approve and censure, and love and hate, and believe and obey, because nature has formed us thus; because such are our natural feelings, and we know they are true to nature, because no warning voice has risen from our fellows to condemn them—as if nothing was true which did not come within the range of our knowledge—nothing to be admitted as the witness of a power above ourselves—nothing believed until proved, instead of all things to be believed until disproved. And all this arises from one and the same source, our contempt or distrust of authority.

Such was not the language of the old apologists when they were called on to defend Christianity, against the charge of a credulous faith. Even with far less advantages than ours—their persons despised, their polity not yet consolidated, their supernatural power denied, or paralleled with those of adversaries; with no support from the confession of the civilized world, or the tradition of eighteen centuries, they still met the charge face to face, and even in the midst of the most powerful appeals to reason, directed to the refutation of heathens, they upheld the principle of faith as applied to the education of Christians. "How," say they, "can a physician heal the sick, if the sick will not trust to his skill?"* "How can grammar, or geometry, or astronomy, or any other science or art, be taught, unless men, on the authority of their teachers, receive lessons which they do not understand?"† Who waits till he has examined opinions before he allies himself to a sect, or could even select his party, if he thus shrunk from committing himself to a teacher, in the fear lest his confidence should be abused? Such is the dictate of nature. All men, in the words of Cicero, "Ante tenentur astricti, quam quid esset optimum, judicare potuerunt. Deinde infirmissimo tempore ætatis, aut obsecuti amico cuidam, aut unâ alicujus quem primum audierunt oratione capti, de rebus incognitis judicant, et ad quamcumque sunt disciplinam quasi tempestate delati ad eam tanquam ad saxum adhærescunt."‡ And without such a happy law of attraction, to give order and stability to the world, society would be reduced into atoms; and those atoms left fluctuating about in a chaos of

* Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. 1.

† Theodoret. Græc. Affec. Cur. lib. 1.

‡ Cicero. Acad. Quæst. lib. 2.

doubt and darkness ; or rather sinking into stagnation, because in reasoning beings no part can move where none is at rest, and may serve as a resting-place to others. On this principle of faith depends the whole activity of life.

“ Who,” says Origen, “ embarks upon a voyage, who marries a wife, who begets children, who cultivates the soil, except in the trust of good to come ; though evil still may come, and often does come ? And yet this hope and faith sends many courageously on deeds where none can tell the end ; how much rather for a cause far other than a voyage, a marriage, or a harvest, shall we repose this faith in Him who endured such sufferings for us, and sent out his disciples upon earth, braving danger, and exile, and death, for the salvation of man.”—*Origen, cont. Cels. lib. i. c. 11.*

We have now finished this rough sketch, not of the philosophy of Plato, for that would require a very different kind of discussion, but of the plan on which his philosophy seems to have formed itself, to meet the exigencies of his melancholy times. If any other can be framed, which serves more clearly to open the many acknowledged cyphers in his works, and give aim to their meaning, and order to their seeming confusion, this must be still more near to the truth. But no theory which leaves them as they are in the eyes of the world—an undigested mass of oratory and poetry, scepticism and dogmatism, irony and seriousness, more like the wreck and ruin of a noble mind, than a system organized and revised by him to the last moments of his life, can do justice to the intention, or can interpret the sentiments of him who, by common consent, is the “ father and king of philosophy.”

We have wished to show that his aim was practical, not idle speculation—that it was directed, in all its parts, against a most false and pernicious school, the natural product of the rationalistic licentious age in which he lived. If his system is to be revived now, let it be revived in this form, and directed against the same nuisance, and it may do the Church and the country infinite service. In this view we think, in England, men are beginning to feel, if not to understand it. And we shall not hesitate to assist, as much as lies in our power, in bringing it more fully to the light.

ART. II.—*Geraldine—a Tale of Conscience.* By E. C. A.
In 2 vols. London: Booker and Dolman. 1837.

THIS is the work of a clever and observant person, though not practised in writing. It is a tale with little incident and no ending; or rather it is an attempt at a tale, which is left unravelled. But in truth its object is very different from that of putting out of hand a well-managed plot, being no other than to recommend the Roman Catholic religion to the favourable notice of the English Protestant; and accordingly it is made up principally of discussions on various points of faith and usage and sketches of character, such as are naturally suggested by the present state and peculiarities of religious parties. In these sketches we conceive the merit of the book lies, for the argumentative portion, as far as it is on the offensive, though not deficient in smartness, is not beyond the ability, and scarcely beyond the opinions, of any one who is not blinded by Ultra-Protestantism; and as far as it is a defence of Romanism, it fails strangely even in matters of fact. Similar failure attends its Roman Catholic sketches, which form an exception, as all readers will feel, to the general spirit and effectiveness of the author's style. It may be, that caricature is much easier than correct drawing, or that true excellence cannot be delineated by a few strokes, or brought out in its substance at the will of a writer; but, however we account for it, De Grey, Angela, Lady Winefride, and Mr. Bernard are but varieties of the "pius Æneas," with the same ambition in the writer, the same failure in the production.

The other characters, however, are for the most part amusingly drawn, and some of them, it must be confessed, good hits. There is a religious indifferentist, with a sufficient insight into the absurdities of the popular ways of thought, a hankering after Catholicity, and a kindness towards the imaginative parts of Romanism; a Whig lord enduring Protestantism and Romanism, yet attached to neither; a High-Church Oxford divine; a Reformation-Society Protestant; a pert young lady inclined to the Presbyterian persuasion; and a parish clergyman of the modern school, amiable, active, uxorious and absurd. Among these personages the heroine moves, being the only child of a widowed father, and heiress of his estates, who, after going through the phases of Protestantism, as it exists among us, seeks for something deeper and truer in Anglicanism, or, as Mr. Palmer more correctly speaks in his recent work, *Anglo-Catholicism*; is disappointed, and at length finds in the Church of Rome the refuge which she is in quest of.

Geraldine, a name which the reader may have already had sagacity enough to give her, is represented as driven from Protestantism by its endless janglings and changes; and from the Anglican Church by the inconsistency at present existing between its principles and practice. She has been originally brought to serious thoughts about religion by members of what is called the evangelical party; for a time she is in a state of great happiness, till she finds herself involved in the disputes and wanderings which it may be said to consist of, rather than to contain. She falls in with Romanists, and wishes to believe a creed which promises to give the peace and stability which she so much needs. In this state of mind she thus speaks to her intimate friend, the Presbyterian already mentioned.

"Kate! Kate! tell me not that every Bible reader knows the truth: I am weary of this repeated but unsatisfactory answer; I have proved its hollowness. You know well the increased interest I took in religion three years ago,—the confidence I placed in the body of professing Christians, both in this neighbourhood and in London, and the conspicuous part which, from my zeal and my position here, I was induced to take in the various religious associations set on foot. What has become of those Bible readers?—those I most trusted! One has ceased to pray, and now can only praise, being certain of salvation; another has joined the Baptists, being dissatisfied with 'infant baptism;' and my former excellent governess, and still dear friend, has become infatuated by the doctrines of the 'Miraculous Gifts;' and has even been worked upon, by the frenzy of excitement, to utter those sounds which her party denominate the 'Unknown Tongue!' She has ceased to communicate with any of her former acquaintances, as being without the pale of the true Church, which has received baptism by the Holy Ghost; but she still yearns after me with the feelings of a sister. I have received several letters from her, and what think you is her constant entreaty? That I will read the Bible, and nothing but the Bible! pointing out to me the chapter hitherto so neglected during centuries, and reserved for these latter days, to be brought to light by the perfected Church. You know the chapter, Katharine; it is the fourteenth of Corinthians, in which there is certainly most distinct mention made by the Apostle of those very gifts of the Spirit, which, like the power of healing, the Irvingites contend would never have been lost but through want of faith. Now, Katharine, I have looked far too deeply into the cause of all this wild, unstable conduct, longer to suppose it the fault of the individuals who have so wandered astray. It is the *system* which I see is wrong,—the system of private interpretation of Scripture; and hence, however I may pity, I can never blame its victims."—vol. i. pp. 9, 10.

Again; we have another amusing sketch of the source of her perplexities in the following passage.

" 'I was referring to a clergyman of the Established Church,' replied Geraldine, 'whom I met in London during the last season; when

having, in addition to Sir Eustace De Grey's defence of his Church, listened repeatedly to that of his aunt, Lady Winefride Blount, and become curious to hear more, I overheard this Rev. Mr. P——, in conversation one evening, at a serious party at Lady Lucy Foster's, make some comments, which I never forgot. 'The present state of the Protestant world,' said he, 'is one of curious contemplation to the philosopher, and one of deep anxiety and pain to the Christian. Infidelity stalks over the land, and will persecute where it dare. The Romish apostacy was superstition and idolatry; the Protestant apostacy is infidelity and anarchy. Each contains in its vital constitution the seeds of these corruptions and abuses. The Romish persecutions have been dreadful, but the infidel persecutions will be far worse; inasmuch as an idolater feels himself responsible to his false god, and the infidel is responsible to nothing. A God obscured is better than a God denied! The Roman Catholic Church is right respecting the power of miraculous gifts in the Church of Christ. There is a constant misapprehension respecting the *power* and the *exhibition* of miracles. If miracles were needless, except in the revelation of a new dispensation, why did they continue in the Jewish Church after it was firmly established? can it be supposed that God would bestow his gifts less on the Christian, than on the Jewish, Church? Miracles *are* granted to a faithful Church.' Much struck by these remarks, I requested to be introduced to this clergyman, to whom every one seemed to listen with as much attention as myself; and from that evening Mr. P—— became a frequent visitor in Berkeley Square. I had hitherto frequented the chapel in —— Street, where I had always been interested and instructed, and where Mr. P—— had himself occasionally officiated; but my new adviser now warned me against the dangerous doctrines that were gradually creeping in at M—— Chapel, without being able, however, to fix for me whither to go instead: 'For,' added he, 'the evangelical body is at present so infected with various heresies that I know not where you would be safe.' 'As a resident in Berkeley Square,' said I, 'my parish Church is St. George's; but all my religious friends assure me, that from the High Church party I should hear nothing that could improve me.' 'Very true,' replied Mr. P——, 'you would never hear the true Gospel from any of the preachers at the great west-end churches. However, do not let this state of things lead you into dissent; for much as I may warn you against the parties in the Church, I doubly warn you against the Dissenters. I have passed much of my life amongst them, and you may trust my experience, that their pride and arrogance are perfectly antichristian. 'No!' added he, 'the more intercourse I have held with the Dissenters, the less I have liked them:—keep clear of them!'

" 'Ha!' cried the warden, suddenly roused from a reverie, 'a sensible man that:—who was he?'

" 'The same man, my dear sir, who assured me, that I could never hear the true Gospel from the preachers of the High Church.'

" The warden was again silent and abstracted, and Geraldine continued. Mr. P—— then inquired whose ministry I attended when in the country? and on my speaking of my dead uncle Edmund,—of his piety,

his zeal, his usefulness,—‘ Yes,’ said he, ‘ Edmund Sinclair is a good man ! we were friends at Cambridge—both at that time staunch Si-meonites : but take care of his notions on ‘ Election,’ for he has a considerable twist on that point.’

“ ‘ Positively, sir,’ cried I, equally vexed and amused, ‘ as I am in such imminent danger from those of my own communion, I had better take refuge in the Catholic Church, where no difference of religious opinion is permitted.’

“ ‘ The Roman Catholic Church, you mean,’ replied Mr. P—. ‘ No ! you must not take so wild a step as that would be. You must not leave the pure worship of God for all those awful superstitions. The Romanists, however, have the right on their side in many things. They have indeed. But now,’ added he, ‘ Farewell ! for I must leave London within an hour :—Farewell ! read your Bible, pray fervently, and rest satisfied that the ‘ assurance of faith in the believer,’ is the highest perfection in the Christian course, and a foretaste of the time when Christ will be all in all.’ ”—vol. i. pp. 147—151.

Her father being at the time away, her maternal uncle, a Dr. Sinclair, warden of ——— College, Oxford, has promised to stay with her at Elverton Hall during the long vacation ; and to him she resolves to open her mind, with the hope of its being thereby settled in the faith of the Church in which she has been brought up. Such a procedure is in the particular case not only candid and sensible, but the evidence of a strong mind, for though the warden has many good qualities they are not exactly of the kind calculated to win over a young female. And here it may relieve the general reader to be told that the said warden is purely an imaginary being, a mere abstract head of a house ; and we must do the author, or, as we suppose from internal evidence, the authoress the justice to say, that, while he is drawn with a good deal of cleverness, there is nothing ill-natured in the picture. He is represented as a person of learning and ability, High Church even to the imputation of Popery, a friend to Catholic Emancipation, and with expectancies from the Whigs. He is grave and dignified, really kind in his feelings and address, though somewhat condescending and pompous, and, when displeased, capable of a cold and stern or “ college ” manner, calm and ready in times of excitement, and gifted with an admirable command of temper.

He has got up his own system well, and knows exactly what answer to give on every occasion ; how far to go with the Romanists and when to part with them. He is full of the praises of Hooker, Mede, Barrow, South, Taylor, Tillotson and others ; hates Puritanism as the ruin of the Church ; and, in spite of his real affection for his niece, has not a very exalted notion of the theological powers of young ladies. His one great defect is what may be called impenetrableness—an absence of all heart, play of

mind, and elasticity of feeling;—in short he is not a person one would by choice take as one's confessor, which makes it the more creditable in Geraldine to consult him, and, we will add, the less likely withal beforehand that he would satisfy her. However, that is not her fault, but the author's; the sole alternative given her in the story lying in the warden's brother, an amiable excellent clergyman, to whom she is indebted for her first serious impressions, but deficient in the definiteness of principle, clearness of mind, and theological knowledge adapted to exercise a hold over a powerful understanding. She feels that, if she is to belong to the Church of England, it must be to the "old-fashioned Church," as she calls it, not to any modern edition of it; those who go so far as to advocate the doctrinal system of the new school in the Church, being bound in consistency to go on into dissent and liberalism, which are its legitimate results. To her uncle the warden, then, she betakes herself; and various conversations between them ensue, which end in the following most satisfactory and hopeful manner.

"Geraldine here pressed her hand to her forehead, and remained some time silent:—at length she exclaimed, 'Then, uncle, I think I understand at last!—As the Church of England is, in essentials, exactly the same with the early Catholic Church of the first five centuries, inasmuch as that Church was infallible, because still pure from its apostolic founders, so also is the Church of England; but she cannot *enforce* any thing that is not proved to have been held by that early Church, and, of course, must not *deny* any thing, clearly flowing from that apostolic source.'

" 'You are right, Geraldine.'

" 'Well! uncle, I am satisfied; and I believe, shall be now, from this time, a very High Church woman, following strictly all the rules laid down for my practice in the 'Book of Common Prayer,' and endeavouring to recall all the wandering sheep of the flock into the one fold. My next interesting task will be the study of those pure ages in Church history, with which we claim kindred and communion: and in the meantime, I thank you, my dear kind uncle, for all your patience and trouble with me. But for you, I should have confounded our Church with the other Protestant communities; but for you, I should ere this have mistaken, as you have said, 'the reverse of wrong for right,' and have become a Roman Catholic!' "—vol. i. pp. 136, 137.

In consequence of the resolution contained in this extract, Geraldine commences the reading of Milner and Mosheim, and determines meanwhile to act up to the rules of the Church in which she finds herself. She makes a list of the fasts of the Church, and gives orders to the cook to serve up no meat upon them. She also tries to prevail on the neighbouring clergy to open their churches on week days, and to keep sacred the days of the Apostles

and other saints, as prescribed. In neither project does she succeed; the fate of the former shall be set before the reader in the author's own words :

“ ‘ Blandford,’ whispered the warden to his ‘ own man,’ who stood at his post behind his master's chair at the dinner-table, ‘ inquire what the joint is, and where it is, and when it is to appear ; I do not understand the plan of the dinner to-day.’ A smile passed over the face of the butler, when summoned by the grave valet to reply to the provost's inquiry ; but the sense of his own official position in approaching a brother dignitary, repressed in the head of the sideboard all undue sense of the ridiculous, as he informed the astonished doctor of divinity, that Miss Carrington had expressly ordered that no joint or meat of any kind should be served up on the ‘ *Hamper Days* !’

“ ‘ Ah ! what—really—oh ! of course—very proper,’ said the warden, with admirable presence of mind. ‘ Everard ! a glass of wine.’

“ ‘ Willingly, warden. On the strength of the ‘ *Hamper Days* ?’ Well !’

“ ‘ The *Ember Days*,’ said Geraldine, much embarrassed by the sudden college look of her uncle, and the struggling mirth which played in the countenance of Mr. Everard and Miss Graham. ‘ The *Ember Days* begin on this, the twenty-first of September, and used always to be kept as days of abstinence in the Church of England.’

“ ‘ Why so ? what was there either sinful or mournful about the *Ember Days* ?’ cried Katharine Graham, ‘ was it then St. Anthony preached to the fish, that we have nothing else at table ?’

“ ‘ Come, come,’ said Dr. Sinclair, rousing himself, ‘ there is plenty to eat, and a very good thing would it be, in a medical point of view, for the overfed portion of society to keep what the Anglo-Indians term a ‘ banyan day,’ once or twice a-week. We all eat too much, according to Cornaro.’

“ ‘ Oh !’ rejoined Miss Graham, ‘ I am sure that we can all do very well with less food, if necessary. I would often most willingly omit my dinner altogether, when I have taken no exercise. But it is the hope of propitiating God by fish and eggs, as holy food, that strikes me as so absurd. I would live on them entirely to do good to my fellow sinners ; for instance, I would eat this insipid whiting every day, to ensure a good meat dinner to some poor exhausted creature ; but for the salvation of my own soul ! and to be, at the same time, seen of men ! why, I can only quote—

‘ The devil must grin ;
For his favourite sin
Is pride that apes humility.’

“ The servants all tittered, and the colour rose painfully to Geraldine's cheeks, though, by a great effort, she preserved silence, and endeavoured to forgive—not Katharine, for from her she had never expected support, but her uncle, who had given her false encouragement by his theoretic adherence to what he shrunk from avowing practically. In his study, and amongst the fasting ‘ *Fathers of the English Church*,’ Dr. Sinclair fasted retrospectively, and was at peace. Great then was his embarrass-

ment at being called upon to patronize the actual abstinence laid down so unmercifully in the Book of Common Prayer, and begun in all the simplicity of obedience by his niece; especially as he was aware of being too learned and noted a person in the Church not to have aroused enemies, who had already impeded his career of usefulness, by misrepresentations of the Popish twist of the learned warden of —.

“ ‘Geraldine,’ said he at length, ‘you remember, in the twentieth article of the Church, that ‘she hath power to decree rites and ceremonies,’ and therefore it may happen, that in her wisdom she may see fit to alter or abridge certain of them for the greater edification of its members. Now, although ‘fasting’ is warranted by the highest example and precept in Scripture, namely, that of Christ, and also of the Apostles, and therefore may be justly reckoned an article of Christian obligation, rather than a rite or ceremony, yet the appointment of certain days for the observance of this duty is a matter of Church discipline, which may be, and has been, altered at various times, all which I will explain to you at some future period. In the interim,’ added he, ‘I believe you need not make us keep any more of the ‘Ember Days,’ although I greatly applaud your zeal for desiring to act strictly according to the supposed commands of your Church.’

“Geraldine, pleased that her uncle had spoken on the subject, and had even praised her, readily gave up the Ember fast, in the full expectation that the alteration of the appointed days would be soon pointed out to her; and she now listened with recovered spirits to the learned conversation which took place throughout the rest of the repast, between the warden and Mr. Everard, on Jewish, Mahomedan, and Pagan fasts. Thence they went off to the Brahmins, till the departure of the servants, who, having at length placed the dessert on the table, finally left the room, completely mystified on the subject of fasting, and with but one clear persuasion, namely, that of the vast learning and power over ‘dictionary words’ possessed by the reverend warden and his friend.”
—vol. i. pp. 175—179.

This incident opened Geraldine’s eyes to the fact that the warden’s theology was properly speaking but a *literature*, that he knew what ought to be *said* on all occasions, but realized very little of the Anglican system in practice. And in consequence a suspicion not unnatural, however unfounded, arose in her mind concerning the reality of the said system itself, represented to her, as it was, in the person of such an advocate; a suspicion whether the distinctions and modifications and adjustments and balancings with which he handled the Protestant and Roman doctrines, were not after all but verbal, and had nothing solid, substantive, abiding, living beyond them. Certainly such a suspicion under such circumstances, it must be sorrowfully confessed, is pardonable; if, for instance, a Church prescribes days of fasting and abstinence, if it has singled out the Forty Days of Lent as such, and if grave persons observe a studied neglect of these, not merely

not ostentatiously fasting, but actually giving dinners and holding festivities upon them, the question at first sight will come across a thoughtful person's mind, whether the whole system is not as shadowy as the particular specimens of it before his eyes, whether it is not a mere collection of arguments, serving as a refuge and excuse against either Romanism or Protestantism, rather than the positive theology of earnest and serious minds. So far then we do not blame but rather pity our heroine; we do not blame an enthusiastic and sanguine person experiencing a certain revulsion of feeling on her disappointment, and for the moment despising and shrinking from the system which had apparently deceived her. But we think that after the first feeling was over, good sense and sobriety ought to have resumed their sway, and to have whispered to her that the faults of others had no legitimate claim to determine her duties, or influence her conduct towards sacred things; that she had set out with a determination to act up to the Church's rules; that her Oxford uncle's not doing so did not excuse her; and that in a case far graver than that which was her present trial, it had been said, "The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat; all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that *observe and do*; but do *not ye after their works*: for they say *and do not*." It will be observed that we are arguing with the author on his or her own ground; we do really admit that Oxford dignitaries neglect fasting in Lent or on Ember days; whether they do or not is nothing to the purpose, nothing to us. Geraldine and others like her should look to themselves before they look at heads of houses; even granting, for argument's sake, they did not fast, but gave dinners on fasting seasons, (which, we repeat, we grant in no other way,) they would not be acting so culpably in enjoying the good things of life, as young ladies in leaving the Church of England on account of it. Now since Geraldine did do so, and mainly because Dr. Sinclair, an individual head of a house, liked dinner in his dining-room, while upholding the duty of fasting in his library, and in spite of her confessing she ought to act up to such rules of her Church herself, and when there was nothing to hinder her, though others did not, we must say that the author has furnished a refutation to her own book, and an Anglican critic need do nothing besides putting together a few quotations from herself. The utmost she can fairly urge in the case she has imagined, is, that the neglect of duty on the part of authorities is a sort of *excuse* and palliation of a similar neglect on our part; but surely it does not *hinder* our personal performance of it. Indeed she has written very ill-advisedly for a Romanist; for, we suppose, she does not mean to say that in Roman monasteries there has never been neglect of the

rules of the Church and of their order. The process of argument which led Geraldine to leave the English Church is the very one which led many an indignant reformer in the sixteenth century to a secession from the Roman; and we presume the author would not justify *that* procedure.

It is then an impatience, and nothing but a sinful impatience, to go out of the English Church for what every believing mind may find in it. The capabilities of our actual state, in the hands of any individual who is moved to use them, are so great, that, putting duty out of the question, it is great inconsiderateness to require more than is given us. Every one may either by faith or in fact develope and realize for himself what is given us in its elements. We have the high doctrines of the Sacraments, Apostolical Succession, Confession, Absolution, Penance, Fasts, Festivals, the daily Service, all recognized as existing ordinances; what do we want but the will to bring into existence what the Prayer Book contains—a will, which, if it exists in the individual himself, will enable him either at once or with a short delay to make all these exist, at least for his own comfort. If he must have an object of ambition, let it be to raise the tone of his own communion. Surely there is as much and as pure gratification in tending piously his afflicted and oppressed mother as in leaving her for another Church, which happens on her surface to have one or two Christian institutions more formally developed, as a set-off against the serious imputations which load her. The captivity in which the English Church lies, if it hinders her from moving, at least allows her children to move more freely. Rome, in some respects more free as a Church, is more free to shackle her children; is it better to have a sick mother or an unnatural one? to be illtreated by the Church itself, or left defenceless to the state? No; if Anglo-Catholics did but understand their position, it would be no despicable one. For ourselves, we find enough of satisfaction in it, not to be eager for any of those changes in the relation of Church to State which late political events and constitutional reforms make abstractedly fitting. What may be the duty of persons in high station in the Church is another matter; or what might be the Church's duty if her members one and all were of one mind and one judgment in all things, or what may be the duty of individuals as a matter of conscience in the event of certain contingencies; but at this moment, we conceive that Catholic truth will spread and flourish more satisfactorily under the existing state of things, than on any alteration which could be devised. We feel no desire for the meeting of Convocation; we are not even earnest in behalf of a repeal of the Statute of *Præmunire*, though it would certainly be becoming and just. We want

changes of no kind, whether in the Prayer Book, or Articles, or Homilies, or Government, except any thing can be shown to us in our present state to be literally and directly sinful. We are content to take things as we have received them, and are quite sure that that system which was sufficient for the expansive minds of Andrews or Laud, has not been so circumscribed by subsequent political events, but it will hold us pigmies, however large we grow. We may like some parts of it less than others; we may conceive that some parts might be more primitive, other parts more finished; but we are thankful to have, and content to use, what has come down to us; and even where any thing has had an unsatisfactory origin, we will make the best of it, and receive it into, and assimilate it to the glorious deposit which we inherit from the Apostles.

What we have been observing of the ritual of religion applies to matters of doctrine also; and it may be worth while to enlarge upon it, though it will carry us some little way from our immediate subject. Geraldine grievously misunderstands her uncle's meaning on this head. He says, that the English Church appeals to the first five centuries; and she supposes this means that *anything* she finds an *instance* of in that period, by dipping into Mosheim or Milner, is our Church's law! But, surely, if he really represents the English Church, he does not mean that any one opinion which any one Father ever whispered or taught, is binding on our faith. If so, certainly our creed would be a worse bondage even than the Roman; for we should have to believe contradictories, and unsay one moment what we said the foregoing. Christianity has in it a great many questions which are but matters of opinion, of doubt, of surmise, in which one person may take one side, another another; which never have been and never can be determined. This is the true field for the religious exercise of private judgment; and for the duty of Christian forbearance and toleration, and this is closed up both by Protestants and Romanists. While Romanists are for settling every thing, Protestants deny there is any thing to settle; they strangely decide, for instance, not that a certain set of questions about the intermediate state *are* settled, which would be strange enough, but positively that they do not exist. They will not allow you even to ask the question about the condition, employments or the powers of departed Christians, ever so religiously, ever so historically, ever so little in the way of speculation, with ever so much deference to the opinions of holy men on the subject. They will not let you do what Augustine and Chrysostom did, and all on the plea that such a liberty has been before now abused; a mode of reasoning most contrary to the genius

of the English Church, and if valid, inevitably stripping the Church Catholic of ordinances, ceremonies, usages and prayer-book, nay, used for that very purpose by Puritans and others. Moreover we may be quite sure that a far worse evil will arise from closing the door to these matters of opinion than permitting them. The human intellect needs some play, as it may be called, and Providence has mercifully consulted this peculiarity, whether we call it a weakness or not. He has given us an innocent outlet for its busy and restless activity. We might have been told peremptorily not to let our minds expatiate at all beyond what is positively revealed; but we are not so told; and the consequence of forbidding what God has not forbidden, will be like stopping a safety-valve. The mind, obstructed in its lawful avenues of thought, will be under the strong temptation to employ itself on subjects, where thought is precluded, the sacred and fundamental articles of faith. The irritation of the reason being denied its natural course, will strike inwards, and fall upon vital parts; not without guilt in those who yield to the temptation; but the responsibility of those who yield is one thing, and the responsibility of those who tempt another; and we are now speaking of a procedure which really acts indirectly as a temptation. We hold, then, that these secondary questions of religion are a sort of guarantee for the immunity of the primary points; further we hold that the consideration of them accustoms the mind to the notion of mysteries or secrets in religion, and thus positively protects and disposes towards the reception of the primary points; so that the suppression of the secondary is one of the main causes which tend to lead educated men among us into Sabellianism, Pelagianism, and kindred heresies. If we are determined to admit nothing but what is clear, while we cut off secondary questions, we shall undermine primary doctrines. Such is the mistake of Protestantism: on the other hand, it is easy to see that the contrary conduct of the Roman Church, of determining these doubtful points *in one certain way*, leads to the same evil by a different road. It makes a doubt about lesser points equivalent to a doubt about greater; and thus tempts the educated mind to snap the tie of faith altogether. Romanism tempts to infidelity, as Protestantism to Socinianism. Equally removed from both extremes, the English Church has set her children's feet, as it has been expressed, "in a large room." She has allowed ample space for diversity of minds, for varying judgments, tastes, feelings, and associations. And this is one reason why we think that Romanism will never spread in England, because whatever is good in it, whatever is adapted to the feelings of particular minds, all this we can enjoy in our Church without leaving her. It were hard

indeed, if Puritanism might flourish in her, in spite of her Catholic formularies, yet that those truer elements which are concealed amid the additions of Popery, should not also be able to spring up under her salutary shadow. Mr. Everard's view of the matter is thus expressed in his conversation with Geraldine:—

“Your duty appears to me to be plainly this, remain in that community of Christians where Providence has placed you; and never think of leaving it on account of its short comings, until you shall have acted up to all that it professes to enforce. This will be but justice to your Church, and proper respect to your uncle, who is deeply solicitous on your account. Believe me, that if you really thus act up to all that your Church inculcates, you will be so nearly a Catholic, that, excepting the points of union with Rome and the sacrament of extreme unction, you will be essentially a member of the Universal Church, and need contemplate no change.”—vol. i. p. 161.

The last sentence is so strangely worded that it cannot of course be literally accepted by the Anglo-Catholic, but, *mutatis mutandis*, it is true. It is true that we of the English Church have Catholicism in its truest sense in our hands, if we have but the heart and the courage to use it; and the laity have but to ask the clergy for their rights, as laid down in the Prayer Book, and they must give them. In short, to return to Geraldine, that ardent young lady need not have turned Papist in order to keep fasts and feasts, or to reverence churches, or to recognize the mystery of the Eucharist, or to reverence celibacy, or to chant psalms, or to receive absolution, in a word to hold and practise the Creed of Cyprian or Augustine.

However, Geraldine is represented as finding out that the Anglican Creed is incompatible with that of the early Church. We do not intend here to employ ourselves on so great a subject as the comparison of our Prayer Book and Articles with the writings of the Fathers; but a few words will not be out of place to show how very little fitted Geraldine, or the author, is for the comparison, how little fitted to determine what is in antiquity and what is not. Indeed facts of all kinds, ancient or modern, are, we shall presently see, very subordinate matters in this “Tale of Conscience.”

Now, first, we must protest against the treatment which the second General Council has received at the author's hands. Merely, as it would seem, because it was held in the same place as the fifth, it is mistaken for it, and set down as held above 170 years after its real date. And then the importance of the matter treated in the second General Council, thus assumed to be the fifth, is urged against the English Church, which it is also assumed stops short at four. What makes the mistake more

notable is, that it is administered to the innocent heroine by her venerable instructor in Romanism, Mr. Everard, while she is artlessly inquiring into the history of the Councils, and exposing and lamenting her own ignorance on the subject. She says—

“The next thing to be done is to read the acts of all the Councils, especially that of Trent, together with that previous and important one, which I always concluded to have been the most guilty, and meant to question my uncle about, namely, the Fifth General Council; for if the Church of England receives the four first as inspired by the Holy Ghost, there must have been something very particular in the Fifth, to have made the Church of England reject it. . . . She claims four General Councils, and, I therefore conclude, she would date the apostasy of the Ancient Church from the guilty acts of the Fifth; but, no! I am now directed on to the last General Council ever held, as the date when the Holy Spirit no longer overruled the decisions of the Church! What then am I to think of these half-admitted, half-rejected intermediate Councils? And what became of Christ's promise to be with the rulers and pastors of his Church *always*, even unto the end of the world? I must have particulars of the Fifth Council. Where was it convoked?”

“‘At Constantinople,’ replied Mr. Everard, ‘*and condemned the heresy of Macedonius against the divinity of the Holy Ghost.*’

“‘Now, can the Church of England venture to doubt this Council?’ inquired Geraldine; ‘Oh, she cannot, it would be impossible; *I thought the Fifth Council had been that of Constance.*’

“‘No, the Council of Constance was the Sixteenth,’ replied Mr. Everard, ‘one only intervening between it and the Council of Trent.’”
—vol. i. pp. 219.

Mr. Everard, the philanthropic pseudo-Catholic whom we have above noticed, should not dabble in matters which he has not studied. He finds his fair disciple in the belief that the Fifth Council is the last but two, and he sets her right by telling her it is the second; not much of an approximation to the truth, we make bold to say. But this is not all. The Council of Constance, it seems, is the sixteenth, “one only intervening between it and the Council of Trent.” It is clear from this that Mr. Everard is not an Ultramontane; else he would not so easily admit the authority of this Council of Constance which limited the Pope's power, and so far as it did so, was not confirmed by him. Bellarmine considers it as one of those which are “*partim confirmata, partim reprobata* ;” that is, which are open to the objection which our heroine in the innocence and goodness of her heart only intends should apply to our Church, when she asks “*What am I to think of these half-admitted, half-rejected intermediate Councils?*” Surely Dr. Sinclair, Warden of —, may refer his niece to Cardinal Bellarmine for an answer to this

interesting question. To complete the series of blunders in this one passage, Mr. Everard not only puts the Council of Constance on a par with those of Trent and Constantinople, but makes it the *last but one before* Trent, though it was held 1414; thus cutting out, if not the Council of Florence 1439, at least that of Basil 1481, which, as Constance, "is partly confirmed and partly disowned," and the fifth Lateran, which is not more than "doubtful." If Geraldine require another variety of these half-visible, half-invisible Councils, which she thought were only found on Anglican ground, she will find it in the Council of Pisa, held a few years before Constance, which, according to Bellarmine, is "neither clearly approved nor clearly disowned." This, then, is an interesting specimen of the reasonings by which this polemical young lady, who is determined to exercise the right of private judgment, is converted to Romanism. We would undertake by similar reasonings, if she would as frankly credit them, to make her turn Jewess or fire-worshipper, or to make her fortunes terminate in a Suttee.

Nay, without any such arbitrary power over facts, it would have been no difficult matter, we suspect, to make this young lady believe anything about antiquity she was inclined to; for she is absolutely bewildered in the jungle, as it may be called, of theology into which she has thrown herself, and makes as many mistakes in the proprieties as a country girl would commit if introduced into polished society. Surely there is something most unbecoming in youth and beauty and fashion and the rest of it being represented as mounted aloft on a library stair, and labouring under the weight of books which she was to make subservient to the settlement of her religious sentiments (vol. i. p. 139). And there is something quite ludicrous in fancying that truth could be attained by such child's play. If she had confined herself to arguments (which she also uses), such as that the English system is cold, that its devotions are meagre and heavy, that it has no authority, that it does not clearly say what it believes and what it does not, that bishops' wives dress well, and that a Protestant Sunday is the dullest day in the week, we might differ from her, but still she would have quite as much right to her opinion as we to ours; but it is another matter when, in her controversy with the warden, instead of confining herself, to use her own illustration, to David's sling and stone, she pretends to have cut off Goliath's head (as she continues it) with his own sword. However, she does attempt this doughty undertaking, and she begins it with a malicious compliment to poor Mr. Everard, which is a suitable introduction to what follows:—

"She found Mr. Everard alone, she laid her hand on his book to

gained his attention, and entreated him to hear what she had to say. The old gentleman looked up smiling, but started when he observed the swollen eyes and pale cheeks of his favourite, and inquired anxiously what had befallen her. Geraldine, without replying to his question, said, with forced composure, ‘ Mr. Everard, *I know you to be noted for your historical accuracy* ; I know also that, although accused of being a dreaming speculatist on impossibilities, you are withheld by no party-feeling from seeing clearly the truth. I come therefore to tell you, and you alone, the result of my researches into Protestant Church History.’ ”
—vol. i. p. 210.

“ The result of *my* researches,” as this impetuous lady most protestantly calls it, was as follows:—and let it be observed, the italics are not our doing, but hers.

“ I find, during the first five centuries, first, that the Apostolical command to anoint the dying with oil, and to pray over them, was constantly observed ; secondly, that an intermediate state of purification for the soul after death was an article of faith ; thirdly, that the sign of the Cross was universal in the Church ; fourthly, that the consecrated elements were held up to the view of the people ; fifthly, that miracles attended the preaching of Christianity ; and sixthly, that the prayers of the martyrs were invoked, and that supplication was made for the faithful departed. I find also that the first four Councils, which are received by our Church, *confirmed all these things, as articles of faith, against heretics* ; and, in short, Mr. Everard, the perusal of these Protestant Histories of the Church has again unsettled my mind, and I am once more as miserable as when the warden arrived, and gave me temporary comfort, by holding out to me the Church of England, as the firm and gentle mother, in whose bosom I was to rest in peace.”

Where Geraldine or the authoress could have picked up this piece of information, to which she has attracted attention by the italic type, we cannot even conjecture. While she was about it, she might just as soon have said that the decrees of the Council of Trent were formally confirmed by the first four Councils, or that Cardinal Pole was one of the Pope’s delegates at Nicæa. It is worth observing the coincidence in conduct between Protestant and Romanist in the controversy, though after all it is but in accordance with the fundamental principles on which they respectively build their faith. The Protestant thinks it no great mistake, to throw together into one the times of Hildebrand and Leo the Tenth ; and the Romanist claims the right of doing the same with the times of Cyprian and Gregory the First. And why, we would ask, should they not do so, on their view of religion ? Ecclesiastical history, as they read it, is “ all the same ” in every age. Each system has a theological key independent of facts, by which it interprets them. Each advocates an hypothesis, contradictory indeed to the other, but at variance also with history, which

lies as a *via media* between them. Each accordingly instead of going to history brings up history to its own standard, supplying from itself a complement of the history's defect or excess, reversing, discarding, straightening, or running with the course of events, as the case may require. In neither of the two is Church history supposed to present to us fixed characteristics; according to the one, it is nothing but a gradual development; according to the other, nothing but a gradual corruption; thus while they both admit, as it were, the same terms in the series, they but reverse the plus and minus signs, and sum it up into contradictory results. If baptism, for instance, or the sign of the Cross, is spoken of in the second century with reverence, the Protestant brings his peculiar theory to bear in the complacent inference that "*therefore* the rise of papal corruption showed itself *very* early;" if purgatory and indulgences are unknown doctrines at the same era, the Romanist in like manner moralizes on the "*holiness* of the Christian body," which did not call for their inculcation. What matters then whether one speaks of the third or sixth century, of the eleventh or sixteenth?—they have always an answer. In the middle ages the Protestant has conjured up a Church among the Paulicians with Milner, or the Waldenses with Newton, and gives up without remorse all that is visible: one age and another are equally *bad*. With the Romanist, on the other hand, one age and another are equally *good*; he views all ages with a charity as entire and as misdirected as is the Protestant's bitter and arrogant hatred of them.

Such is their *concordia discors*; and between the two the history of the last and most august dispensation which Providence has given us is sacrificed to human theories, being no longer considered as the deep oracle of His counsels and His ways, but as if it could be poured out and exhausted into the cisterns of scholastic systems. Not that we would impute to the present author so grave a fault as this, but that of falling in with the tone and spirit of those who are guilty of it. She takes for granted her conclusions are right, and therefore is little solicitous about the facts of the case; they *must* come right at last. And if any one here objects to us, that every one, not profoundly learned, must do this in a measure, we answer, of course he or she must, but surely is not bound to *publish* and urge as *arguments* what he has not duly inquired into.

If it were worth while to go into the particulars of the charge which has led to these remarks, we should have still more evident proofs of the looseness and cloudiness of the author's statements. For instance, she says that during the first five centuries, "*an intermediate state of purification for the soul after death was an*

article of faith.” Now what is here meant by “an article of faith?”—a definite statement necessary to be believed in order to salvation? This is to oppose the current doctrine of the Romanists, who maintain that the Church may convert doctrinal truths *into* articles of faith, and that *this* is one of such, being not determined at earliest till the Council of Florence in the fifteenth century. Again, if it was an article of faith, how could it be true, as it is, that views taken of it in these early centuries *differ* from the present Roman view? Does not all this show it was an open question, a matter of opinion, a point on which the private judgment of the individual had to decide this way or that, as he best might, or that it was not then an article of faith, whether or not the Church had the right of making it one, which is a further question. And then again the author speaks, as if *all* that the Roman Church held about purgatory were, that it is a place of purification, whereas considered not as the Catholic, but as the *Latin* Church, as found among Latins, and teaching in the west, it expressly teaches in the Catechism of Trent that purgatory is a place of fire and pain as hell is.*

Our author's under-estimation of facts in argument extends to contemporary history as well as ancient. The dreadful visitation of the cholera is only of yesterday; what happened during it our readers ought to know quite as well as she does; yet we suppose it will be news to them to be told that the English clergy were remiss in their pastoral duties on that trying occasion. However so we are informed in the work before us, viz. that from one cause or other, principally from regard to their wives and families, they shrunk from the trial; and a romantic picture is presented to us of a Roman priest being first “hooted and pelted” with “yells and execrations” by the “ignorant and capricious mob” of a town, we believe in Staffordshire, with the connivance of “the leading people, including perhaps some even of the clergy;” then the cholera breaking out, a re-action taking place, and a notion spreading that the disease was a judgment for his expulsion and ending in his triumphant return. But this is but a poor specimen of the extent to which the author's creative powers carry her; in order to do her justice, we shall present the reader with an extract of some length.

“At the hour when the bearer of the warden's note started on his commission, the Rev. Edmund Sinclair, his beautiful wife, and four elder children were enjoying, from windows that looked not on the in-

* On the history of the Roman doctrine of Purgatory, one of the latest tracts of the series called Tracts for the Times may profitably be consulted. It is scarcely necessary to add, that Geraldine's other alleged primitive points of faith are either founded on misrepresentation or are not denied by our Church.

fect town, the calm soft air of a July morning. The fair twin girls were busily employed in some little work of fancy, while their younger brothers were equally engrossed in raising a bridge, with prepared arches and bricks sent them by their uncle, the warden. No lessons were thought on that bright morning; for it was their parent's wedding-day; and besides a promised ride each on the pony, and sundry other pleasures, a magic lantern was to wind up the evening, to which all the establishment were invited. The father of these happy ones, having finished his breakfast, reclined in a reading-chair, which was likewise the gift of the elder Sinclair, partly following the theories of a modern theological author, partly watching the labours of the little architects on the carpet, and partly endeavouring not to hear the whispered secret between his little girls and their governess, respecting the present to be made of their work to papa and mamma, before they went to bed.

" 'Mamma,' at length cried one of the boys, who, despairing of the scientific arrangement of the bridge, was playing at a window, 'there is the cholera signal put up at the hall. Come here, and look: there it flies from a high window, just over the cedars!'

" The whole party flew to the window, and Mr. Sinclair ascertained the fatal truth, that some one, perhaps his brother or niece, had been seized by the unsparing malady. At that instant the footman entered with a note from Dr. Sinclair, informing his brother that their departed sister's old and faithful housekeeper had been attacked by cholera,—that her mind was oppressed by some secret she wished to impart,—and that while she would not permit him, the warden, to attend her dying bed, she called out repeatedly for Mr. Edmund.

" As Mr. Sinclair perused this summons, his wife, eagerly leaning over his shoulder, devoured its contents. 'Thomas,' said she to the servant, while she secured the note, and plunged it into a flower vase filled with water, 'leave the room instantly, and desire the messenger from the hall to go round into the garden; we will throw the answer to him from the window.' The man obeyed. 'Edmund,' continued she, turning to watch the expression of her husband's countenance, 'you are not mad enough to listen to your brother's selfish suggestion? You surely do not believe one word of the old woman's preference for you?'

" 'And why not?' replied Mr. Sinclair, 'I am her parish priest; she naturally turns to me. I have held this living, the gift of General Carrington, nine years, during which time his household have constantly attended my ministry,—they have, therefore, a claim on me for the last consolations of religion.'

" 'Good heavens!' exclaimed his wife, 'do you actually think of putting yourself in the way of certain death?'

" 'I must leave consequences in the hand of God,' replied he, solemnly; 'and now, my dearest Charlotte, let me entreat you not to place these constant obstacles in the way of my obvious duty. Do not forget, as, alas! you have too often done, that, in marrying one of my holy profession, you bind yourself to assist, not to retard, your husband, in his vocation.'

" 'I cannot listen to preaching now, Edmund,' interrupted his wife,

becoming extremely agitated. ‘Answer me plainly,—‘Yes,’ or ‘No,’—do you mean to go to the hall?’

“‘I do,’ replied he, and rushed to the door; but his wife had anticipated him, and, turning the lock, placed the key in her bosom, and sank on her knees before him.

“‘Charlotte, my love, I cannot submit to this,—I cannot be detained,’ cried the husband. ‘Is it not enough to have prevented every personal effort I would have made amongst the sick and dying poor, but that you would force me to deny the last request of a faithful though humble friend? Charlotte, recollect yourself,—exert more Christian strength of mind, or you lose yourself in my regard.’

“‘And what is an old servant, what is a friend, compared to your wife, to your children? what claims can equal theirs? and how can you answer to your conscience the bringing back to us this fatal malady?’

“‘God will preserve my family,’ replied Edmund Sinclair, trembling with emotion. ‘My own Charlotte, think of the vows I have taken as a Gospel minister; and remember that, if unfaithful to them, I can never expect Divine assistance.’

“‘I know not what were your vows as a clergyman, Edmund, for I never heard them,—I only know what they were as a husband; and, by those remembered vows, I hold you fast. I will not let you go. Is it thus you would ‘love and cherish me till death do us part?’ Is it thus you would desert the devoted mother of your children, or return to destroy her?’

“Mr. Sinclair here endeavoured to raise her, fondly kissing the hand he held, but at the same time turning his eyes towards the window, whence escape was perfectly feasible. Mrs. Sinclair, however, caught the direction of his looks and thoughts, and throwing her arms around him, burst into tears; while, as the wondering and tearful children gathered round them, the governess ventured to suggest, that, ‘if the warden or Miss Carrington had sent for Mr. Sinclair, it would have been painful to have refused them, but that this old woman was no relation.’

“Mr. Sinclair sighed as he replied,—‘Every soul is of equal value in the sight of God, and with Him all men are brothers. To the inmates of the hall I have bound myself as their pastor before God. My own love, be reasonable, be more than reasonable, be full of faith and trust, and the Master, whom I serve, will protect me and comfort you.’

“‘Oh! Edmund, for God’s sake do not go on talking to me in those set phrases! I know very well what the obvious duties of a clergyman are; and I am certain that carrying about the infection from house to house, is not one of them. It is your duty to obey the Government, and the Board of Health has officially commanded that the contagion should not be thus conveyed. You know all this very well, Edmund, I read you the announcement myself from the newspaper; and you also know the dissatisfaction that was expressed because the Roman Catholic priests would not obey the law of the land.’

“ ‘ Not the law of the land, Charlotte ; no punishment could attend its infraction : but now listen. I must go up to the hall, but I will not return here immediately. I will pass the night at the lodge, and then change my dress.’

“ ‘ And there die,’ interrupted the wife, ‘ and see me die there, and the one yet unborn ! Yes ! kill us both at once, and then be satisfied that you have well fulfilled your ordination vows ! Go ! go !’ cried she, with hysterical vehemence ; ‘ go, you love me not,—you never did, and you shall never see me more !’

“ Accustomed as he had long been to similar scenes, whenever bent on the fulfilment of those clerical functions in which danger to himself might be dreaded, Edmund Sinclair had never been so powerfully affected, even during the first months of his marriage. This beautiful and devoted creature had passionately thrown herself at his feet, and her sobs echoed in his heart : he thought, also, on this their anniversary.

“ The children, fully understanding that their mother was in distress, and their father in danger, joined their lamentations to hers, each little hand fastening on his dress, to force him to remain in safety, while the gentle governess again expostulated : ‘ Surely, Mr. Sinclair, these dear ones have the first claim on you. Excuse me, if I take the liberty to think you have, in this case, mistaken the line of duty. God can never bid you forget that you are a husband and a father.’

“ Mrs. Sinclair had now ceased to sob and lament ; but it was not that she listened to this last appeal in her favour, for her frame, incapable of longer sustaining this highly wrought state of feeling, sank heavily on the floor, and her rebellious grief was lost in forgetfulness.

“ ‘ Great God !’ cried the agonized husband, as, disengaging himself from the children, he raised his apparently lifeless victim, and bore her to a couch. ‘ Thou canst not demand the annihilation of these very affections which Thou Thyself hast blessed. Charlotte, my best treasure, I quit you not. Miss Rigby, tell the messenger from the hall that Mrs. Sinclair is too ill for me to leave her, that I send my best wishes and my blessing to poor old Goodwin, and that I entreat she will have no human preferences at such a crisis, but consent to see my excellent brother the warden. And take the children away, Miss Rigby : I wish to be left with my wife.’

“ ‘ I cannot, sir,’ exclaimed that lady, ‘ the door is, you know, locked ; and even, while fainting, Mrs. Sinclair still grasps the key.’

“ Tears gushed into Edmund’s eyes as he drew forth his Charlotte’s now unresisting hand from the folds of her dress : it fell powerless, and dropped the key. The governess and children withdrew ; and, no sooner was he freed from witnesses, than sinking on his knees, by the couch of his still insensible wife, and burying his face in the cushions, Edmund Sinclair gave way to the remorseful emotions of his soul,—for he had yielded to the enervating effect of earthly love, and, in the husband, lost the priest of God !”—vol. i. pp. 41—48.

This is much worse than Geraldine’s confusing the second and

fifth General Councils, and Mr. Everard's annihilation of the Council of Basil; it is a very shameful fabrication; but more comes presently. Not content with accusing clergymen's wives of keeping their husbands from their spiritual duties, this "*Tale of Conscience*," as it styles itself, proceeds to a further charge, so odious, that we almost retract what we have conjectured, and are tempted to deny that its writer is a woman. It actually accuses a clergyman's wife of teasing her husband out of a secret committed to him in confession on a death-bed, and then without a day's delay spreading it among her gossips. Now considering this must be meant to intimate what is natural and usual in the English Church, and cannot be taken as intended as an extraordinary exception to general rule, and is deliberately put on paper, not by a foreigner at a distance, but by one who has seen much of English society, or at least has taken, in some of its features, a shrewd and discriminating survey of it, we do marvel that he or she has had the heart and still more the head to prefer a charge which is as stupid as it is malicious. Why, it beats the story we have lately heard something about somewhere, of Pope Gregory and his fish-pond of infants' skulls; for what is Pope Gregory to us? and, though he was our great benefactor, still one can understand men, brought up as they are, not feeling any great sensitiveness for the honour of one who died hundreds of years before we were born, and whose existence and graces have never been thrust upon their senses by sight and touch and hearing. It is but ordinary and bearable irreverence to heap accusations upon one who after all was but a pope, considering all popes must be bad men; but with all the advantages of sight and hearing, friendly intercourse, the claims of society, and the influence of personal intimacies, thus deliberately to sacrifice our clergy and their wives to a mere *theory*, the theory of Romanism, which requires that *facts* should be thus reversed, and the course of things turned inside out, evinces a hardihood which is characteristic of Rome, and which is too extreme and barefaced to excite any angry or impatient feeling. It is their loss who believe it.

Indeed, the authoress seems to feel she has gone too far, and shows signs of compunction; for presently we are favoured, as a set off, with a little sketch of a good parson's wife, or in the words of Mr. Everard, whose luck it has been to discover this rare jewel, "*the one good clergyman's wife of my acquaintance, the Protestant sister of charity, the 'reverend mother' of her little parish.*"—vol. i. p. 293.

And now perhaps we have said enough to satisfy the reader's curiosity as to this tale, which has made a sensation in some cir-

cles. It contains an amusing exposure of Ultra-Protestantism; it may be useful in shaming members of our Church into a more consistent profession of its principles: it is quite harmless as a controversial defence of the Church of Rome.

ART. III.—1. *Lectures on Justification.* By John Henry Newman, B.D., Fellow of Oriel College, and Vicar of St. Mary the Virgin's, Oxford. London: Rivingtons. 1838.

2. *The Primitive Doctrine of Justification, investigated: relatively to the several Definitions of the Church of Rome and the Church of England; and with a special Reference to the Opinions of the late Mr. Knox, as published in his Remains.* By George Stanley Faber, B.D., Master of Sherburn Hospital, and Prebendary of Salisbury. London: Seeley and Burnside. 1837.

It is allowed, we presume, by all who are fairly entitled to call themselves Christians, that fallen man stands in need both of pardoning mercy, and of sanctifying grace; that both these blessings have been purchased for him by the mysterious and atoning virtue of the Redeemer's blood; that, through faith, the redemption thus offered to the whole world, may be personally realized to every individual in it; but that, without a believing heart, no man can receive the offered redemption, or retain it when bestowed. Thus popularly stated, nothing can well appear more transparently perspicuous, than the scheme, which the God of all mercy and consolation has devised, for our recovery from moral and spiritual ruin. And yet, it is unspeakably painful to reflect how soon the transparency seems clouded, when the "heavenly vision" is intently gazed upon by the eye of disputations curiosity. One might almost imagine that celestial Truth resented this inquisitive examination of her very essence,—this invasion of her inner sanctuary; and that, in order to baffle and humiliate the pride of mortal wisdom, she suddenly arrayed herself in a shadowy mantle, when approached by them that would analyse and decompose the glorious element which forms her tabernacle. It would seem, as if the column of flame before us was, then, to our confusion, changed into a pillar of darkness: that so, the wise and the prudent should be left to *stumble on the dark mountains*; while the simple and artless wayfarer was walking in the light, and rejoicing that, at every moment of his progress, the way of the Lord was plain before his face.

Such are the thoughts that are apt to rush in, and to disquiet us, whenever we behold the pure atmosphere of the Christian verity thickening as it were into thunder-clouds, and then descending upon the earth in angry and destructive torrents, and laying waste, for a time, the peace and happiness of man. The spectacle is one which makes us feel as if wrath were going forth against that impatient spirit of inquiry, which is wandering evermore over dry and thorny places, *seeking rest and finding none*. And, when we are assailed by these sorrowful imaginings, we find no comfort but in the prospect of that time, when we shall no longer see, as through a glass, darkly; but shall know, even as we are known.

Others, however, there are, who look more cheerfully upon the fermenting, and sometimes tempestuous, agitation of the elements; as if this were a needful and salutary process, whereby alone the world of theology could be kept from falling into deadness and stagnation. And, among these, may be numbered that hardy and adventurous thinker, Alexander Knox. The spirit of hopefulness is predominant throughout the whole compass of his writings. There is scarcely an error, whether in religion or philosophy, which, according to his scheme of thought, has been without its appointed office and commission. Nay—the *very final cause* of heresy itself, in his persuasion, is, the eventual development and confirmation of the truth. And, as for the various schools of theology,—in his sight, they were actually pre-ordained, for the express purpose of guarding respectively, from age to age, certain departments and regions of the truth, which might, otherwise, have suffered for want of the protection thus especially provided for them. Augustine, for instance, was appointed to labour at the foundations of the Christian character, and to keep down its lofty pretensions, and towering thoughts; lest human merit should exalt itself, to the dishonour of Divine Grace: while the office of Chrysostom, and others of his type, was to raise up and to adorn the superstructure, that the whole might grow into an holy temple to the Lord. The province of the Schoolmen, again, was to discipline the mind to doctrinal precision, and to exercise the understanding in matters which are external to the soul of man. The Mystics, on the contrary, were eminently useful in watching the interior movements of the soul, and in graduating the scale of spiritual proficiency, and in marking the growth of the inward man towards the fulness of the Christian strength and stature. So that, by the action of these antagonist forces, a right direction might, ultimately, be given to the mind of all Christendom. In conformity with these views,

he seems to have imagined, that the correction of erroneous principles might, in some instances, chance to be premature; that a hasty attempt at the reformation of opinions, would be nothing better than a vain contention against the order of Providence; and that, even if successful, it would only cut short the period of serviceable agency assigned to this or that peculiar system. We find him, accordingly, declaring his conviction, that “no writer, on this earth, is more misunderstood, or misrepresented, than St. Paul;” and, yet, immediately adding,—“I am, however, little less persuaded that the misconception has had its use—its important use; and that the correction of it, where it has prevailed, would, at any other period than the present, have been impracticable, if attempted, and pernicious if accomplished.”*

Now, all this is extremely consolatory. There is, at present, a great stirring of opinions among us, relative to certain matters which, as many persons imagined, had been fixed, since the days of Luther, as immoveably as the pillars of heaven. For the last three centuries, a large portion of the Protestant world has directed “the office and devotion of its view,” towards the Reformation, as stedfastly almost, as if that were the era of the first promulgation of Christianity. Of late, however, some counter-revolutionary symptoms have begun to manifest themselves: and it is highly satisfactory to be assured that the movement has taken place just at the right moment! A. Knox himself appears among the foremost of the watchmen who have made it their business to observe the signs of the times, and to note the proper season for enterprize and action. And, being satisfied that the hour was come, he girded himself up,—uttered his voice,—and startled the high Protestant community with the assertion, that they had mistaken the doctrine of St. Paul relative to the vital subject of justification.

How his memory has been assailed for thus daring to violate the citadel of the Reformed Faith, is now generally known. He has been accused of an attempt to throw us back into the arms of Popery. He has been charged with exalting the traditions of men above the oracles of God. It has even been affirmed, with a mixture of compassion and horror, that he lived and died without a Saviour! All this tragical outcry, had he survived to hear it, would probably have inflicted very little disturbance upon his spirit. And, we should apprehend that his admirers and friends need be under no great alarm for his good name on earth, or, we may venture reverentially to add, for his destiny in heaven. If

* Knox's Remains, vol. i. pp. 284, 285.

A. Knox died without a Saviour, we can hardly think, without trembling, on the case of those, who flew upon him with a virulence, which the Saviour would surely have visited with his sternest rebuke and condemnation.

A. Knox, however, is now gone to his rest; and has left the contest respecting the true doctrine of justification to other combatants. Two of these are now before us: and they appear under circumstances not very common at the present day. It usually happens, in our times, that the conflict touching debatable matters of the Christian faith, is carried on between parties, one of which appeals to the Scriptures alone, in high disdain of all assistance from the voice of primitive antiquity, towards a safe interpretation of the Scriptures; while the other party insists on the value, and the authority, of primitive antiquity, on all questions, involving doubt or difficulty touching the mind of the Spirit by whom the Scriptures were dictated. But this is not the case with Mr. Newman and Mr. Faber. Both of them, of course, appeal to the Scriptures, as the only ultimate authority. Both of them, too, appeal to the sense of primitive and Catholic antiquity. And, lastly, both of them appeal to the Homilies and Formularies of the Anglo-Catholic Church. Nevertheless, each of them has arrived at a different conclusion!

Before we proceed to a consideration of their arguments and statements, we are tempted to offer, as it were parenthetically, a few moderate and simple words, respecting the principle upon which these divines have conducted their inquiries, namely, a renunciation of what is called the *right of private judgment*. Nothing, we suspect, can well be more crude, more confused, and more full of emptiness, than the notions very commonly entertained respecting the unlimited liberty of prophesying, which is claimed by the high and rigorous Protestant Defenders of the Faith. They seem to imagine that the champions of the Catholic Theology are disposed to call in question the *abstract right* of every individual to search the Scriptures for himself, and to form his own judgment relative to the principles and doctrines therein contained. Now, unless we egregiously mistake them, the champions of the Catholic Theology do no such thing. These men have too much common sense to deny the mere *abstract right* of every human being to do the most silly, the most perilous, and the most fool-hardy things, that can enter into man's imagination. It never comes into their heads to dispute the *abstract right* of any individual to ruin himself, if such should be his pleasure. If they should chance to meet a traveller on his journey through a difficult country, the roads and passes of which were utterly un-

known to him, and who yet should insist on his right to find out his own way for himself, in resolute disregard of all guidance from finger-posts, or from the information of persons well acquainted with the localities,—they would never think of disputing the right and privilege of the adventurer to lose himself in a forest, or to get engulfed in the mire, or, at best, to find, after much weariness and toil, that he was wide, by many a league, from the place of his destination. They would, doubtless, benevolently warn him of his danger; they would remonstrate with him on his folly and his obstinacy; and they would entreat him to remember that he would have himself to thank for the disastrous perplexities and difficulties which might befall him on his journey. Perhaps they might even do more; and tell him, that if his wanderings should chance to have a fatal termination, he might have something like the guilt of suicidal rashness to answer for. But they would never dream of collaring the freeborn man, or of handing him over to the constable, or of consigning him to the cage or to the stocks. Now this case appears to us to illustrate, with tolerable precision, the principles of those who contend against the ultra-protestant licence of *private judgment* in matters of religion. They contend against it, because they believe it to be imminently dangerous; because they know it to be in opposition to the maxims and the habits by which men are guided in the prosecution of their temporal interests; because they feel that no man in his right mind would venture to set up his individual opinion against the collective wisdom and knowledge of former ages. They say to every inquirer after divine truth—by all means, search the Scriptures; and then, if there be modesty and humility in your nature, you will probably soon feel yourself compelled to exclaim, with the eunuch, *How can I understand, except some one should guide me?* And what guide is so sure, as the voice of the Church; in other words, the unanimous deliverance of Christian teachers and expositors, commencing from the earliest ages, and continued on through centuries? And if, in spite of all remonstrance, the inquirer should reply, that he scorned to acknowledge for his master, either any one man, or any collection of men, whether ancient or modern,—nothing would remain to be done, but to tell him, that if such were his resolution, he must even follow it, at his own peril. But, assuredly, there would be no invasion of his free-agency, no violation of his abstract right. The Church of Rome, indeed, knows nothing of this free agency or abstract right. She not only visits it with the spiritual scourge of the Anathema; but she calls upon the secular arm to chastise it with the scorpions

of corporeal torture. But, not so the Church of England. She, sorrowfully but not angrily, consigns the recusant to another tribunal, where justice will be finally administered in mercy.

But then, we are sometimes told, that to resort to mortal teachers, is to proclaim, that "the Scriptures are not light, but darkness; and that the word of man interpreting, is clearer than the word of God interpreted; that is, that man's word will be clearer than God's; a rush-light brighter than the sun!" Then, why, in the name of all that is wonderful, why do the very men who tell us this, surround themselves with rush-lights; while they scornfully cast away the torches which were lighted from the altar, in the days of Apostles, and of Apostolic men, and which have been passed on to us, from hand to hand, through a long series of generations? Why do they heap up to themselves expositors and commentators, while the Fathers are well nigh cast to the moles and the bats? Why do they hang upon the lips of a favourite preacher, as if his words were able to breed in them divine and infallible faith; while the volumes of Clement, or Cyprian, or Chrysostom, are treated as mere repertories of licentious and fantastic tradition? Why, in short, are they,—who are foremost to assure us that the Fathers were but men, and liable to error,—why are they content to derive their nourishment chiefly from the ordinance of preaching, instead of living by every word that proceedeth *directly* from the mouth of God himself?

But, to return to Mr. Newman and Mr. Faber. And, first, of the former. We have several times perused Mr. Newman's volume; and, in some parts, desperately hard reading we have found it! We say not this to the disparagement of the work. On the contrary, this is our testimony to the labour, the patience, the erudition, which he has brought to bear upon the subject. The writer is too awfully impressed with the solemn importance of the questions before him, to content himself with puncturing their surface. He has delved deeply into the bowels of the matter; and has, consequently, provided a pretty severe trial of strength and endurance, for all who would profitably attend him throughout his task. He has, however, occasionally relieved the severity of their toil by bursts of such eloquence as can issue only from a mind which, throughout all its faculties, is possessed and pervaded by a sense of unseen and eternal things. Here and there, indeed, he seems to have bewildered himself—(at least, he has occasionally bewildered us)—in the labyrinth of scholastic subtlety. And, once or twice, his imagination seems to have seduced him a little way into the realm of shadowy and mystical fancies: But he speedily emerges from the land of visions; and resumes

his course, with vigorous and patient tread, along the ground of substantial disquisition.

The first question examined by him is,—what are we to understand by the justification of a Christian man? With respect to this question, the attention of divines is, most commonly, divided between those two schools which stand at the antipodes of each other,—the Romish and the Lutheran. The Romish doctrine is well-known. As defined at the Council of Trent, it affirms that we are justified, not by the imputation to us of perfect righteousness, nor by the imputation to us of faith for righteousness; but by the infusion of virtue from Jesus Christ into the human soul. The virtue thus infused, becomes *inherent* in us; it justifies us, or makes us righteous, before God; it empowers us to satisfy the divine law; and, provided we depart in grace, it enables us *truly to merit* eternal life. The same doctrine, nevertheless, protests against the boastfulness or self-confidence of man. It acknowledges the whole to be a gift procured for us, by the merit of Christ, from the goodness of God; which goodness is] so great, that, what are truly his gifts, he willeth to be estimated as our merits.

All this, doubtless, sounds very vile and odious, in Protestant ears! And yet, this is the doctrine which, as Rome asserts, was received by the Catholic Church from the Apostles; and which, through the suggestion of the Holy Spirit, she has ever since constantly retained. Now, whether the doctrine be Apostolical, or not, in *other* respects,—there is, upon the face of it, one fatal blemish, one “damned spot,” which never can have been fixed there by Apostolic hands. The doctrine, it is true, ascribes the whole blessing of justification to the free mercy of God. But then, it makes the gift, when once bestowed, entirely our own; so entirely, as to become, to us, a source of true and positive desert. The merit, which was originally Christ’s, is, in baptism, made over to ourselves, as completely, as a possession or an estate is transferred from one person to another, by a formal deed of gift. We may, thenceforward, cultivate it, as it were wholly on our own account. It may, indeed, become worthless for want of cultivation; or, it may, by the terms of the grant, be forfeited by gross and long continued abuse or neglect. But, if it should prosper in our hands, we may accumulate the proceeds even to superfluity; and leave a surplus to be disposed of, by proper trustees, for the benefit of less diligent and more necessitous occupiers. That the Romish system would bear this construction—nay, that it invited this construction,—is manifest from the results. We have all heard and read enough of that mighty reser-

voir, into which the superabundant merits of the Saints were constantly overflowing: and, of the manner in which the waters were distributed, for the refreshment and comfort of those,—who could afford to pay for it!

In this system, Luther, it is well known, could find no anchorage for his soul. He could get no rest or peace, until the fountain of divine mercy was unsealed to him by the doctrine of justification by faith,—and by faith only;—which doctrine he accordingly proclaimed to be the article of a standing or a falling Church. According to this system, we have nothing, within ourselves, which is worthy of the name of righteousness: and our justification consists in the ascription to us of a quality which does not, at any time, in reality belong to us. We are just, only by what is usually called a *forensic* imputation. Our righteousness has, in fact, no existence, if we may so speak, but in the mind of God. And faith is the instrument, or the means, or the condition, by which the advantages of this gracious estimate are originally obtained for us; and, by which, only, we can hope to secure a continuance of the blessing.

Now, the difficulties of this scheme appeared to A. Knox, to be absolutely insuperable. He professed himself utterly unable to imagine that the Deity would even confer upon us a title, to which there was nothing actually correspondent in ourselves. He seems to have considered it as unworthy of God,—and therefore as impossible,—that God should declare any one to be righteous,—or account him to be righteous,—or deal with him as righteous,—otherwise than with reference to some moral quality inherent in that individual. And this difficulty drove him back into a theory which, it cannot be denied, approximates very closely to the exploded theology of Rome. The approximation, however, did not much discompose him. His greatest embarrassment arose from the manifestly imputative, or *forensic*, language of certain of our own formularies. But he extricated himself from the objection, by affirming that God *pronounces* us to be righteous, simply because he has previously *made* us so.

The theory of Mr. Newman,—(which, as he contends, is no other than that which was entertained by the Catholic Church, and subsequently adopted by the most eminent of our own Divines)—takes a middle course between the Romish and Lutheran extremities. He conceives that we are justified,—not by the infusion of a moral quality into the soul, as the Romanists maintain;—*not* by a *mere* imputation, as affirmed by Luther and his followers;—but, that our justification consists in the presence of the Saviour himself within us, as effected and administered by the mysterious agency of the Spirit. We are accounted

righteous in the sight of God, because, by his gracious and mighty working, there is within us, after baptism, the very author and finisher of our salvation,—the very source of all pardoning mercy and sanctifying grace,—the very fountain which cleanseth from all sin,—the very well-spring which gushes out unto everlasting life. In short, justification is, with Mr. Newman, a comprehensive name for every imaginable spiritual blessing, which the Christian dispensation can possibly confer on man. The following are his own words :—

“ It may be remarked that whatever blessings in detail we ascribe to justification, are ascribed in Scripture to this sacred indwelling. For instance, is justification *remission of sins*? the Gift of the Spirit conveys it, as is evident from the Scripture doctrine about baptism; ‘ one baptism for the remission of sins.’ Is justification *adoption* into the family of God? in like manner the Spirit is expressly called the Spirit of adoption, ‘ the Spirit whereby we cry, Abba, Father.’ Is justification *reconciliation* with God? St. Paul says, ‘ Jesus Christ is in you, unless ye be reprobates.’ Is justification *life*? the same Apostle says, ‘ Christ liveth in me.’ Is justification given to *faith*? he also prays, ‘ that Christ may dwell in’ Christians’ ‘ hearts by faith.’ Does justification lead to holy *obedience*? Our Lord assures us that ‘ he that abideth in Him and He in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit.’ It is through justification that we rejoice in *hope of the glory* of God? in like manner ‘ Christ in us’ is said to be ‘ the hope of glory.’ Christ then is our righteousness by dwelling in us by the Spirit; He justifies us by entering into us, He continues to justify us by remaining in us. *This* is really and truly our justification, not faith, not holiness, not (much less) a mere imputation; but through God’s mercy, the very presence of Christ.”—pp. 166, 167.

Now, on this, we have principally to remark, that, if any writer chooses to indicate the whole assemblage of privileges and benefits provided for us in the Christian economy by a single word,—be that word justification, or salvation, or redemption, or any other term,—there is, in the abstract, no good reason for denying him that indulgence; provided always, that due notice of his intention be given to the reader. Whether such a proceeding be convenient or judicious, or not, is a distinct question; the determination of which may depend on a variety of circumstances. The use of the single term, however, may possibly tend to produce confusion and disturbance in the mind of multitudes, who have long been accustomed to a different phraseology. No orthodox Christian, for instance, that we are aware of, disputes that every blessing above enumerated by Mr. Newman, is actually comprised and wrapped up in the Covenant of Grace. On this point, there, surely, cannot be a moment’s dissension between the most rigid Protestant, and the purest Catholic. But then, the

Protestant has been taught and accustomed to observe that, in the Covenant of Grace, there are certain things which Christ has promised to do *for* us; and certain other things which he has promised to do *in* us. The things which Christ has promised to do *for* us, in the Protestant nomenclature, are generally denoted by the term *justification*; those which He has promised to do *in* us, by the term *sanctification*. It does not follow from this, that the Protestant contemplates these blessings as things which, though they may be formally different, are separable from each other in the mind and counsels of the Deity. Neither is it to be supposed that he denies, that both these gifts are essential to our ultimate acceptance. But then, to say the least, he finds the above distinction convenient; and, he moreover, believes it to be eminently useful. It is a permanent, serviceable, and compendious testimony, against the Romish error, which tempts us to merge the remembrance of absolving mercy, in the triumphs of infused, inherent, and truly meritorious righteousness. And, it really does appear to us, that some very cogent reasons, indeed, ought to be produced, before we attempt to deprive him of whatever benefit or aid he can derive from this mode of statement.

That such cogent reasons may be produced, is, obviously enough, the persuasion of Mr. Newman. The Scriptures—the primitive Christian writers—the schoolmen—the Romish divines—the Protestant divines—all have been painfully examined by him; and the result has been, a firm conviction, on his part, that the above Protestant statement is a vicious statement; that it gives a confused and imperfect view of the manner of God's dealing with our fallen race; that it has a tendency to keep down our thoughts in the dreary region of our own infirmities, instead of lifting them up in aspiration after all that is pure, and holy, and sublime. It stifles, as he conceives, all hopeful reliance on the work of the Spirit in our hearts; and suffers the faculties and powers, which the Fall has left us, to run to waste, in wayward and feeble musings, touching the dark and helpless condition of our nature. And, thus, it may gradually convert the Christian soul into a gloomy chamber of imagery, haunted by forms as shadowy and variable, as the fantastic shapes which the eye of fancy discerns in the fleeting clouds of heaven; whereas, in fact, the soul is designed to be no other than the House of God, wherein the Divine Shekinah may dwell, as truly as it did of old in the Jewish sanctuary, and, beyond comparison, more gloriously. So that, when we are chiefly occupied in watching the caprices and vicissitudes of our frames, and feelings, and conflicts, and experiences,—instead of fixing our regards on the unchang-

ing Power which abides within us,—we are guilty of something like a “specious idolatry.” We are, in reality, occupied with ourselves, while we ought to be absorbed in adoring contemplation of the High and Holy One, who deigns to make the heart of man his tabernacle; in order that self may be, as it were, forgotten and lost, and that He may be all in all,—the Alpha and the Omega of our thoughts. Mr. Newman further contends that, the righteousness and sanctity which result from the soul’s intimate and incessant communion with the sovereign perfection, have, in them, a proper and formal justifying quality; seeing that, albeit comparatively dim and faint, they still are reflections—from the soul, as from a mirror—of essential and uncreated brightness. The Deity, when looking on our better deeds and thoughts, is contemplating only a partial emanation from himself, which cannot fail to be pleasing and acceptable in his sight. And, if so, it follows that whatever holy desires, or good counsels, or just works, may shine forth in the life of the Christian, may, truly and safely, be regarded as elements of his justification. The mirror, indeed, which reflects the splendours of the indwelling Godhead, may be foully soiled, and meanly fitted for its sacred office. But, by a mysterious operation, it may gradually acquire a purer polish, and even a truer form; till, at length, it becomes worthy to render back, in the sight of men and angels, a discernible image of the Divinity Himself. And the satisfaction imparted by a consciousness of this advancement from brightness to brightness, and from glory to glory, is solid, substantial, and divinely animating. Whereas, they who are strangers to any justification but that which is external to themselves,—they who know and feel nothing of an interior and indwelling righteousness—are in danger of wandering in the midst of shadows. Their comfort, if they have any, is often little better than “such stuff as dreams are made of.”

Such, if we have rightly collected his meaning—(and we have laboured most conscientiously to do so)—are the views entertained by Mr. Newman, relative to the scheme of man’s justification. He will, of course, be prepared to hear those views loudly—(we hope, not angrily)—questioned. There are, doubtless, many who will be ready to protest against the faithfulness of the portraiture given by him of the *Protestant* doctrine, as illustrated by its effects. And, to say the truth, whether that doctrine be correct or not, we can hardly believe it to be fairly chargeable with all the dangerous, and even fatal consequences, which he has so confidently ascribed to it. The doctrine, if abused, *may*, unquestionably, taint the soul with the deadly antinomian venom; or, may drug it with an opiate, which shall people the brain with visions and with phantoms; and may so unnerve the man, that he shall

be unable to go forth like the worthies of old, who, through faith, wrought righteousness, and, out of weakness were made strong. But we seriously doubt whether Mr. Newman has not—though quite unconsciously—exaggerated and multiplied the evils actually produced by the system which he denounces as erroneous. He himself, indeed, confesses that the advocates of the rigid Lutheran scheme, are frequently distinguished by a life and conversation much higher and holier than the principles which they profess. And this one consideration, though it furnishes no excuse for apathy or indifference in the search after truth, supplies, at least, abundant reason for extreme caution, in estimating, and bringing to a test, the principles themselves.

It is utterly impossible for us, in a brief essay like this, to conduct the reader through the maze of investigation, by which Mr. Newman has arrived at his conclusion. The whole pith and marrow of the question, controversially considered, may be found in his Appendix, on the Formal Cause of Justification. We, however, are compelled to content ourselves with a somewhat desultory statement of certain reflexions which occurred to us, in the course of our examination of the whole volume.

In considering, then, the condition of a Christian, it appeared to us that the matter might be intelligibly exhibited something after this manner. Let perfect obedience be represented by a right line: man's obedience, by a curve line, more or less irregular, *below* it; but approaching it, sometimes more closely, and sometimes less; and, here and there, all but touching that line. Now, nothing short of a path along the line of perfection can satisfy the justice of God. Nothing short of this is fully entitled to the name of obedience. If, then, through the mysterious virtue of the atonement, we are accepted, just as if we were walking along the right line, while, in fact, we are walking in the inferior one, it is obvious that there must be, virtually, a process of *imputation* constantly going on in our favour. Every step below the upper line, is a violation of the law, a short-coming of perfect obedience,—that is, a *sin*. And, if so, our justification must, in this life, from first to last, essentially and formally consist “rather in the remission of our sins, than in the perfection of our virtues,”—conformably to the confession of Augustine. The curve,—as we proceed and gather steadiness and courage,—may become less and less irregular, and may approach, more and more nearly, to the line which represents perfection. But, while we are on our way through this world, every point in the curve will always be beneath that line, and will never once actually touch it. In other words, we must remain sinners to the last. And, if we are dealt with, as if our obedience were undeviating, must it not

be, throughout, in consequence of what we may venture to call a merciful and gracious *fiction*? a *fiction*, however, which does not compromise the truth or justice of God: not his truth, for it tends to no deception; not his justice, seeing that a full, sufficient, and perfect satisfaction has been made, for his violated law.

And, now comes the question, whether there is any thing, in the inward life and condition of a Christian, of which it can safely be averred, that it shares, with the merciful imputation above described, in the office of *justifying* the sinner. And, here, we must confess, we are at a loss for any thing like a graphic or *geometrical* illustration of the case. It is clear that, if our goings forth, along the inferior line, are to contribute towards constituting us truly righteous and obedient men, it must be by virtue of something different from the mere course and direction of our steps. The most sainted among men are never quite in the right path. There must consequently, while we are beside or beneath that path, be something in the motives which animate our exertions, or in the powers vouchsafed for our aid, to give a peculiar value, a sort of preternatural dignity, to our struggles, before we can derive any confidence in our efforts, as a formal cause of our *justification* in the sight of God. And, *that* something, as we have seen already, Mr. Newman discovers, in the sacred presence of the Saviour in our souls, by the ministration of the Spirit. The Christian does not go forth upon his journey as a common man. He has that within him, which essentially distinguishes him from all others who start upon the race that is set before them. His inward man is pervaded by a life, of which it is but little to say that it exceeds the moral vitality of our unsanctified nature, as much as the mental surpasses the animal capacity. And this it is which imparts to his labours and designs a character of righteousness, which could not otherwise belong to them. He toils onward, in the greatness of his way, not in his own strength, but in the strength of Him who is the source of all power and might, and who dwells in him, as in a temple. He is righteous, therefore, not by any inherent rectitude of his own nature, but by virtue of the interior presence of his Saviour. His obedience, although its course is not coincident with the line of perfection, is nevertheless *accepted*, in consideration of the pure and celestial fountain from which it flows. And this *acceptableness*, as Mr. Newman contends, enters essentially into the process of his *justification*. To express the matter in his own words:—"In this, I conceive to lie the unity of the Catholic doctrine,—that we are saved by Christ's imputed righteousness; *and*, by our own inchoate righteousness at once." (App. p. 414.) In a word,—(to resort to an illustra-

tion of Mr. Newman's,)—there is a certain line, which, although beneath the line of perfection, separates the walk of the renovated man, from the walk of the natural man. (p. 99.) To lift us above that line, is the work of Divine grace. And, if our own exertions (assisted, as they will be, by the power within us,) should be sufficient to keep us from falling below that line, then may it be truly said that those exertions are instrumental to our continuance in the state of justification.

One formidable objection to this representation, is, the extreme difficulty of fixing upon the boundary, which fences off the region in which we are safe, from the region in which we must be lost. The line of perfect obedience is clear and distinct, and unchangeable as the holiness of God. But who shall undertake to describe the other? Not, however, to dwell on this,—there is another thing which can scarcely fail to strike any man, who contemplates this system attentively; namely, that it is, throughout, a system of imputation, though in a splendid and magnificent disguise. In spite of all precaution, *imputation* (or, correlatively, non-imputation) will shine through the *whole* texture of the scheme. To say that “Grace triumphs, through righteousness, *in spite of the remains of sin,*”* what is it, but to say that *the remains of sin* are *imputed* no longer; that they are not suffered to mar, or to disturb, the triumphant achievements of Divine mercy; that God no longer beholds iniquity or perverseness in his people? To affirm that our doings have in them a truly justifying quality, because the author of all righteousness is given to us, as an inmate with our own spirits, is virtually to affirm that God looks upon our deeds, not as they are, actually, in themselves, but as they are done in Christ. And what is this, but another mode of expressing that we are *reputed* actually righteous, because we have that within us which mightily *tends* to make us so? It is true that a Christian man may be able to do what a heathen man cannot. He may perform an obedience which God can accept, without any impeachment of his holiness and majesty. But, why is such obedience acceptable? Why, but because the imperfection which, more or less, adheres *to every act of it*, is mercifully overlooked; and because there is One present with us, with whom the Father is always well pleased, and whose perfect righteousness he vouchsafes to ascribe to us, and to reckon of it, as if it were truly, naturally, and inherently, our own. A Christian saint, indeed, may be righteous, as compared with the most virtuous and exemplary heathen, and may be so esteemed in the sight of God and man. But the Christian saint himself must remain, throughout his whole course, exposed to the curse

* Newman, p. 99.

of the law, if his performances (whatever may be their source) were brought to a judicial scrutiny, instead of a paternal estimate. Whether, therefore, under the law, or under the gospel, must not our language always be, *Enter not into judgment with thy servant, O Lord; for, in thy sight shall no man living be justified?*

That the forensic or imputative notion enters into the very essence and formality of our justification, would seem to follow, irresistibly, from the words of St. Paul, 2 Cor. v. 21; *He hath made him (Christ) to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God, in him.* For it is beyond all dispute that, if sin be ascribed to Christ, it can be only by imputation. And, if so, how are we to avoid the conclusion, that, correlatively, it is by imputation only, that righteousness can ever be ascribed to us? This argument is very strongly urged by Mr. Faber (p. 133, &c.). And it cannot be denied that his view of the matter is powerfully corroborated by the language of Chrysostom; who, after insisting that sin is here ascribed to Christ, and righteousness to sinners, in the most express and forcible terms that could possibly be used, continues thus:—"It is the righteousness of God, when we are justified,—not from works, in which case it would be needful that no stain should be found,—but, from grace, where all sin is made to disappear."* It will hardly be contended that Chrysostom is here speaking only with reference to works performed before justification: seeing that, of no works, performed either before or after, can it be predicated, that they are *without a stain*. And the inference is, that if, at any time, we are dealt with as righteous, it must be in a sense corresponding to that in which Christ was dealt with as a sinner.

That, in a sort of secondary sense, indeed, our own inchoate righteousness is subservient to our justification, we apprehend few Protestants of any class or type will be disposed to deny; although they may employ different modes of phraseology, for the expression of their feelings and opinions. Mr. Newman himself, for instance,—(though sorely displeased at the presumption of the Lutheran divines, for ruling that we are not *really* righteous, when the Almighty has declared that we are),—Mr. Newman himself is content to call our inchoate righteousness an *improper* formal cause of our justification. (Appendix, p. 427.) The Anglican divines maintain that we are saved *in* Christ's righteousness, yet *not without our own*. (App. p. 414.) And the strictest disciples of the Reformed school, in effect, say much the same thing. For, although they shrink from assigning to our obedience any power to impress upon us an internal form or character

* Chrysost. Hom. ad loc.

of righteousness, they yet allow that there is, (no matter how or why,) an intimate connexion between our justification and our sanctification, between our absolution from guilt, and our striving after innocence and rectitude; and, that where the latter is not, the former will be little better than a nullity. All parties, therefore, seem to contend for the necessity and the efficacy of sanctifying grace, as well as of pardoning mercy. And, if so,—what is all this endless debating, but vexation of spirit, and weariness of flesh?

When brought to a practical issue, the grand question, after all, is this: be the worth or dignity of our obedience what it may, can any man look back upon it with a confidence at all approaching to that, with which he contemplates the atoning blood, by which the remembrance of his frailties and his trespasses is washed away? Can he prevail upon himself to reckon much upon the proper *justifying* virtue of the best and holiest deeds, which he has done, in the days of his probation? Augustine, we have seen, could not: for, he has taught us that, in this life, our righteousness consists rather in the remission of our sins, than in the perfection of our virtues. St. Ambrose could not; for his words are these,—“ I will not glory because I am righteous, but “ because I am redeemed; not because I am exempt from sins, but “ because my sins have been remitted; not because I have been “ profited, or because any man hath profited me,—but, because “ Christ is an Advocate for me with the Father,—but, because “ the blood of Christ has been poured out for me.” Pope Gregory could not; for he exclaims:—“ The Righteous Advocate “ will defend us, as just and blameless, because we know and “ condemn ourselves as unjust. Let us, therefore, put our trust “ not in our tears, not in our actions, but in the pleading of our “ advocate.” St. Bernard could not; for he says, on his sick bed,—“ I confess that I am unworthy, and unable, by my own “ deserts, to obtain the kingdom of heaven. But he is worthy, “ who obtains it by a double right,—the right of inheritance from “ the Father, and the merits of his own passion. He himself, “ being content with the former of these, has freely given the “ other to me. And, in resting my claim upon this gift, I shall “ never be confounded.” Lastly, our own Hooker could not; for, even though it may be true, that, as Mr. Newman has observed, his views were not finally matured till towards the close of his life, yet there was one thing in which he was steadfast and immoveable to the very last. His dying words are engraved on our hearts: “ Lord, I plead, not my righteousness, but the forgiveness “ of my unrighteousness, for the sake of Him who came to pur- “ chase a pardon for penitent sinners.”* When we are looking

* See Newman, Appendix, pp. 400, 401.

forward, indeed, it may well become us to work as if our strivings were able, of themselves, to win for us the crown of glory, and honour, and immortality. Then, if any, is the time for us to render ourselves up to the heart-stirring thought, that all things are possible to him who has, for an inhabitant of his soul, the spirit of Christ himself, the power of God, and the wisdom of God. But, when the day of retrospect arrives,—when we reflect how often these splendid possibilities have gone down in miserable failures,—when we think upon the dismal fact that, throughout a great portion of our course, it would seem as if Christ had dwelled with us in vain,—then are we constrained to cast away, as bordering upon impiety, all hope of justification, save that which rests on pardoning and redeeming mercy. The very recollection of the mighty gift which we may have suffered to remain dormant and inert within us, must, of itself, be sufficient to bear us down with shame and confusion, and to extort from us the cry, Lord, be merciful to me a sinner!

We are here reminded of the saying of Augustine, that grace enables us to *fulfil* the law; which saying is produced by Mr. Newman, (p. 62,) in opposition to Luther's assertion that God's commandments are impossible. It may be worth while to consider this for a moment. As an abstract theoretical proposition, then, it may be true that, with grace, it is possible to fulfil every tittle and iota of the law of God. For, of no one righteous act can it be affirmed that, with the aid of divine grace, it might not have been performed. And of no one sinful act can it be affirmed that, by the aid of divine grace, it might not have been avoided. And yet, every one must see that this sort of possibility is a mere affair of speculation: just as much so, as the dynamical effects, ascertained by the exact theorems of science; but never precisely exemplified in nature. The whole history of mankind proclaims the difficulty of perfect obedience to be such, that, in spite of all the aid vouchsafed to man, the recurrence of the commonest phenomena in the physical world is not more absolutely certain than frequent failures of moral rectitude. Whether perfection be, in itself, possible or not, we are all sure that it never has been, and never will be, exhibited to mortal eyes; quite as sure as we are, that the seasons will be diversified with cloud and sunshine. And thus the question returns upon us, with aggravated force,—if grace makes perfect obedience possible, and yet our obedience is always imperfect, how can that obedience, in any one act of it, be ever acceptable, otherwise than by a process of gracious and compassionate imputation? It is acceptable, Mr. Newman tells us, because it is sprinkled with the atoning blood; which sweetens and purifies it, and imparts to it an acceptable

character. But, surely, any act of obedience which needs atonement at all, must have in it something very like a taint of sin. And, it is difficult to understand how the atoning virtue can change the inherent quality of the act itself. So far as we can discern, the atonement can do no more than secure for the act, a more indulgent and favourable estimation, than it would otherwise receive. The holy incense of the altar may overpower the earthly savours which issue from the sacrifice; but can scarcely impart to the sacrifice itself a fragrance which is alien from its nature.

The statements of Mr. Newman on this subject are occasionally such as to involve—we are unwilling to say a contradiction,—but something so enigmatical, that our poor sagacity is often baffled in the attempt to furnish the solution. For instance,—he contends, first, that justification and sanctification are, substantially, the same thing; that they are properties, qualities, and aspects, of one and the same gift: and this statement, he maintains, is entirely warranted by the language of Scripture. He, next, affirms that, viewed relatively to each other, justification *follows* upon sanctification: an assertion which, however, he allows to be true in a *popular* sense, but not in an *exact* sense. And, accordingly, he afterwards declares that justification *tends* to sanctify. The sanctifying power is to justification, what the breath of life is to man. It is the very principle of its vitality. “To quench it, is as if we stopped a man’s breath: it is the death of that from which it proceeds,” (pp. 67, 95.) We are not quite sure that we rightly apprehend the force of this illustration. It would seem strange to say, first, that the vital breath is the source of animation; and then, that the man having thus become a living soul, his nature becomes gifted with a *tendency* to animate and to actuate the frame. First, the breath of life makes the man. Then, the man is identified with his own life. And, lastly, the life is represented as a property, or power, proceeding or originating from the man. The cause is, first, identified with its effect; but, nevertheless, in the end, changes places with it. There appears to us to be a sort of *glamour* in all this, which can hardly furnish a correct representation of the dealings and operations of divine wisdom. We speak, however, with all becoming diffidence; seeing that Mr. Newman toils at the establishment and illustration of his positions with all the earnestness of the most profound and deliberate conviction. He has pursued the subject through many a page of extremely refined and elaborate disquisition. He takes us up into a region, the atmosphere of which is somewhat too highly rarefied and subtilized for our gross organs of respiration. There may, however, be many others, endowed with facul-

ties better adapted to the enterprize: and to them we must, accordingly, commend the adventure.

It appears, from the whole tenor of his work, that Mr. Newman recoils, with something approaching to a positive antipathy, from the thought of a justification *external* to ourselves. He seems to derive but meagre satisfaction from the contemplation of what was done *for* us eighteen hundred years ago; or, of the gracious change of purpose—(we speak after the manner of men)—which prevails in the council-chamber of God, far out of our sight, and beyond the reach of our thoughts. What, then,—is it little that there is, no longer, wrath in heaven? Is it little that atonement has been made, and that the plague has been arrested? Is it little that the mouth of the adversary has been stopped; and that, now, there is none that shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect, so long as they are striving—(though with various success)—to walk after the Spirit?—But, then, Mr. Newman contends that our condition would still be desolate and comfortless, if there were not also something *nigh unto us, in our hearts, and upon our lips*. And is there nothing *nigh unto us, and in our hearts*? Does he not himself describe in breathing thoughts, and in burning words, the glory and the blessedness of the gift that is in us,—even the sacred presence of the Lord who bought us? And does this gift become dubious, and, comparatively, worthless in his sight, when its efficacy is denoted by the term *sanctification*, and its peculiar province separated, in our thoughts, from the office of absolving grace? True is it, that our justification would, of itself, be an imperfect thing, if it amounted to nothing more than a transitory act of absolution, the virtue of which was momentary, and passed away with the waters of baptism; so that every future lapse or failing should be, as it were, engraven on the rock, beyond the power of the atoning blood to wash away. And still more strange would it be, if God had dealt with us something after the manner in which human laws often deal with pardoned or acquitted felons; if he had first absolved us from guilt, and then, as it were, had turned us loose again upon the world, just as naked and defenceless as before, against its manifold temptations. But He has not dealt thus with us. He says unto us—Behold an amnesty for the past. Behold, too, a mighty gift of power, to uphold your future steps in the path of righteousness and peace. And, lastly, behold,—mercy and goodness are not yet exhausted. The same price which first purchased your forgiveness, shall likewise be accepted as a ransom for your stumblings and back-slidings, while toiling faithfully along the steep and narrow way. And, in the scheme of redemption thus prepared for us, and offered to us, we

cannot surely but discern two different compartments; in each of which, though they be closely contiguous and united, a distinct process is, respectively, carried on,—the justifying process, whereby sin is, from time to time, remitted; and the sanctifying process, whereby sin is gradually subdued. And something like this appears to have been in the mind of Augustine, when he said: “*In renascentibus remittitur peccatum. In proficientibus minuitur. In resurgentibus tollitur.*”*

We must here conclude what we have room to offer on the import of justification. And we know not how we can better conclude it, than by transferring from Mr. Newman's pages to our own, the following words of Barrow; in the wish, rather than the hope, that they may extinguish this smouldering controversy for ever!

“To each person sincerely embracing the Gospel, and continuing in stedfast adherence thereto, God doth afford His Holy Spirit as a principle productive of all inward sanctity, and virtuous dispositions in his heart, enabling and quickening him to discharge the conditions of faith and obedience required from him, and undertaken by him, that *which is by some termed*, making a person just, infusion into his soul of righteousness, of grace, of virtuous habits. In the scripture style it is called, ‘acting by the Spirit,’ ‘bestowing the gift of the Holy Ghost,’ ‘renovation of the Holy Ghost,’ ‘creation to good works,’ ‘sanctification by the Spirit,’ &c. which phrases denote partly the collation of a principle enabling to perform good works, partly the design of religion tending to that performance. Now all these acts (as by the general conduct of Christians, and according to the sense of the ancient Catholic Church, so) by all considerable parties seeming to dissent, and so earnestly disputing about the point of justification, are acknowledged and ascribed unto God; but with which of them the act of justification is solely or chiefly coincident, whether it signifieth barely some one of them, or extendeth to more of them, or comprehendeth them all, (according to the constant meaning of the word in Scripture,) are questions coming under debate, and so eagerly prosecuted: of which questions, whatever the true resolution be, *it cannot methinks be of so great consequence*, as to cause any great anger or animosity in disputes one toward another, seeing they all conspire in avowing the acts, whatever they be, meant by the word justification, although in other terms, seeing all the dispute is about the precise and adequate notion of the word justification; whence *those* questions might well be waved as unnecessary grounds of contention, and it might suffice to understand the points of doctrine which it relateth to in other terms, laying that aside as ambiguous and litigious.”

It now remains for us to consider what is the nature, and what the office, of that Faith, by which, or through which justification

* Aug. contra Jul., lib. vi. c. 16.

is obtained. And here, as the investigation proceeds, we find that faith becomes gradually invested by Mr. Newman with a monopoly as absorbing as that conferred by him on justification. We have already seen that, in his estimate, justification is equivalent to the whole collection of evangelical blessings. And now we perceive that faith is only a comprehensive name for the whole assemblage and family of the Christian graces. This grand result, however, opens upon us, by degrees, in the course of our journeying over a vast extent of laborious and perplexing disquisition; at an early stage of which occurs this question:—"Faith is acceptable, as having something in it, which unbelief has not. That something, what is it?" (p. 150.) Now, just let us, for a moment, reverse the question; thus, "Unbelief is offensive, as having something in it, which faith has not. That something, what is it?" To this question, the answer is simple enough. Unbelief is offensive to God, because it has in it a principle of opposition to the authority of God, and of factious resistance to the testimony of God; a temper of self-will, which, rather than surrender one jot or tittle of its lofty independence, will not hesitate to *make God a liar*. Now, faith, (whatever *else* it may have in it,) must evidently involve a principle, or a quality, directly the reverse of that which enters into the very essence of unbelief. And, if so, it surely is no very difficult matter to imagine, that it cannot well be otherwise than acceptable to God. Nothing, of course, is further from our thoughts than the notion, that faith, or any other human quality or act, can ever, in strictness of speech, be *meritoriously* acceptable to the Deity. But faith, considered merely as the opposite of unbelief, must always imply a state of mind, without which it is at least impossible to please God. The voice of what is called natural religion,—nay, the voice of common sense,—tells us as much as this,—that he who comes to God, must believe that He is; and that He is the rewarder of them that diligently seek him: and further, that, in the absence of such belief, all that goes by the name of religion, can be nothing better than mere delusion and hypocrisy. The Apostle, clearly, speaks of this as a self-evident matter,—an undeniable axiom. Faith then, upon the very lowest estimate that can be formed of its excellence, is the seminal and vital principle of every religious sentiment; for, it is that, without which no religious sentiment can exist for a moment. It, therefore, can scarcely seem surprising that it should, likewise, have been selected as eminently worthy to open to us the portals of revealed religion; and, further, that a high and transcendent office should have been graciously assigned to it, throughout the whole economy of the Redeemer's kingdom.

These considerations, however, we grievously fear, will afford but scanty satisfaction to Mr. Newman. For he asks, in another place, (p. 300,) “Why must *trust* be a part of the essence of “justifying faith, yet love and obedience external to it?”—Why?—because *trust* is a feeling, or a state of mind scarcely separable, even in thought, from a belief in the truth of the Gospel dispensation. We feel the attempt to divorce them to be a violence done to our nature. The faith of the devils may, possibly, be alleged to the contrary. But there is, in their condition, a dreadful peculiarity; forcible enough to effect this most unnatural separation. The Gospel is not known to them, or propounded to them, as a scheme of mercy. They know, on the contrary, that they are beyond the pale of mercy altogether: and, therefore, they believe and tremble. *Trust* can never enter into their faith; any more than *trust* can enter into the feelings of an atrocious criminal under sentence; although he may be firmly satisfied that the crown has the prerogative of pardon, and the reigning prince an indulgent and compassionate disposition. But it is not thus with them, who receive the overtures of redemption. To them, the Saviour may be considered as speaking in this manner:—“Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy “laden. I demand no past services. I inquire not into past “transgressions. I ask nothing, at this present, but a submissive “reliance on my power and will to save you. And, for the “future, I ask a continuance of that reliance, that the work of “your salvation may be prosperously carried on: a reliance, “which, if cordial and sincere, will assuredly produce obedience, “while it banishes deapair.”

But, here, we are met, by Mr. Newman, with the question, Why should trust result in obedience? Why should good works be the fruit of a reliance on the revealed mercies of God? Surely, the wonder is that it should ever be otherwise! The natural presumption is, that any religious sentiment or principle will manifest itself in a course of conduct in harmony with that principle. “Can that man possibly believe the Gospel?” is the exclamation which bursts from every sound mind and honest heart, when revolted by gross inconsistencies in the life of one who makes profession of the Gospel. The belief, of which we speak, indeed, from the nature of the case, is widely different from that which men repose in the narratives of history, or the deductions of science. It is different, because it is directed to a very different object. Historical faith, indeed, or faith in the discoveries of philosophy, have each a strong tendency to the production of certain appropriate results. They exert no influence on the moral conduct; but, on the whole, they do exert

a mighty influence within their own peculiar sphere. The natural tendency of religious faith, on the contrary, is towards the production of fruit within the domain of morality; and this, for a very plain reason, because it has the God of all righteousness for its object. He that embraces the Gospel, embraces a scheme, the design of which is to atone for sin, and, eventually, to abolish the dominion of sin. His faith, therefore, if it be awake, must hold out a gorgon head before him, whenever he wilfully deviates into the ways of sin. It must haunt and pursue him with a tormenting sense of his own duplicity, and leave him no rest till he makes a vigorous effort to regain the paths of rectitude. His religious faith, it is true, may often fall asleep, and fail to do its office: and so may the prudential faith of the children of this world; and hence it is that both the world and the church are filled with prodigies of incongruity. But still it remains true, that the faith of each, respectively, has a natural tendency to produce the fruits of obedience;—the one, of obedience to the dictates of prudence,—the other, of obedience to the will of God.

That these statements, however, should appear to Mr. Newman unworthy of the dignity of justifying faith, will hardly be surprising, when we find that he considers faith as deriving the powers ascribed to it, from the grace of justification itself! Faith, he assures us, does not precede justification. On the contrary, it is a fruit of the justified state, (pp. 150, 151); “a supernaturally implanted instinct, developed by religious obedience, and determining the mind to the word of Christ and his Apostles.” (p. 306.) And again, justification precedes faith, *and makes it justifying*. (p. 260.) Moreover, faith, though of later birth than justification, is, nevertheless, the recipient of it: and, accordingly, the whole process of our salvation is described as follows:—“Justification comes through the sacraments,—is *received by faith*,—consists in God’s inward presence,—and *lives in obedience*.” (p. 518.) Now, we are not much in the rationalizing habit of rejecting hard sayings, merely because they are hard. On the contrary, we endeavour to keep constantly in mind, that God’s ways are not as our ways, nor God’s thoughts as our thoughts. Still, we cannot but plainly avow that our capacities are sorely tasked by the above exposition of Mr. Newman’s. For, if it be correct, it compels us to hold that a man is justified *by* something, or *through* something, which did not exist, or which did not come into action, previously to the commencement of the justified state; and, further, that justification produces that which is the recipient of justification itself! It is beyond our ability to extricate ourselves from the confusion

which comes over us, in contemplating the process here described. And our perplexity is not much relieved by the assertion that "the highest praise of faith before baptism, is, that it leads to it; and its highest efficacy, after, that it comes from baptism." (p. 275.) Why—if faith comes *from* baptism, surely it cannot have existed, even in the most imperfect condition, before baptism; and, therefore, could have led to nothing! And yet, that it had some sort of existence before baptism, seems to be admitted by Mr. Newman, for he afterwards allows that faith must be, *substantially*, the same habit of mind, under all circumstances; otherwise it would not be called faith. (p. 278.) So that we must presume his meaning to be, that faith, after all, *does* precede justification; but, that it does not acquire any justifying dignity or power, till the process of justification has commenced; in short that although it is a necessary pre-requisite to justification, it has, in fact, no justifying efficacy but what it derives *from* justification.

We cannot but reverentially hope, that there is something more of directness and simplicity in the divine counsels, than we are able to discover in the views here adopted and expounded by their interpreter! And, it does appear to us, that all this confusion might be avoided, by considering faith to be, as truly a needful antecedent to justification, as baptism by water is; an antecedent ordained of God, and graciously accepted by him, as sufficient for the work whereto it was appointed; namely, first to introduce us into a state of salvation, and subsequently to keep us there. The initial faith may not, indeed, be reckoned worthy to be compared with the same faith as it afterwards appears, when the process of renewal is advancing. It may, then, expand, together with the growth of the spiritual faculties, and gather round itself all other graces. And so, it may become fit for the office of sustaining and continuing those blessings which, even in its callow and unfledged condition, its appointed agency was suffered to procure for us. At first, it was permitted to unlock the treasury of Divine mercy. Afterwards, we may consider it as promoted to the function of guarding and dispensing the treasures there contained. If, indeed, it should slumber at its post, the soul may remain poor, in the midst of measureless abundance; and perchance, alas! the precious possessions (in this respect like earthly riches) may make to themselves wings, and flee away. But, if it should be vigilant, and true to its high office, what tongue can tell the bounteous usury with which the treasures shall be measured out to us!

If it should be said, that any faith which may exist before justification, cannot be pleasing or acceptable to God, the answer

must be, that He is, at that period, willing to accept us, according to what we have, and not according to what we have not. This is his merciful and gracious mode of dealing with us. He then counts our faith, imperfect and almost purblind as it may be, for righteousness unto us; though he will count it so no longer, if it does not afterwards work by love, and result in obedience. The initial and introductory faith, indeed, may probably have in it some elements of affection, of hope, and cordial submission to unseen realities. But it is certain that it can have nothing truly and positively meritorious in itself: for, to meritorious dignity it never can advance, even in its most mature and exalted condition. It must, therefore, be regarded, at the beginning, the middle, and the end of its course, as holding its office, solely and entirely because it has been God's sovereign pleasure to place it there. Some sufficient reasons we may, perhaps, be able to discern for its appointment to the function. But we know not enough of the divine purposes to speak confidently as to this. It, accordingly, best becomes us to ascribe the whole, from first to last, to God's unsearchable benignity and wisdom.

This view of the subject appears to us to derive very strong confirmation from an ancient maxim of the Church, adverted to by Mr. Newman, that the faith of catechumens, dying before baptism, might avail for their reception into the kingdom of heaven: a notion which could scarcely have prevailed, if the Church ascribed to initial faith no higher virtue than that which is attributed to it by Mr. Newman. If, however, the catechumen had lived, and said,—I am conscious of having faith, and therefore see no need of baptism,—doubtless the Church would have held him for an heathen and a publican. The very refusal to submit to the express ordinance of Christ, would, of itself, have been sufficient to negative his claim to the character of a believer. And similar to this would have been the case of St. Paul himself (produced by Mr. Newman in support of his own views), if St. Paul had declined the injunction of Ananias. The faith of St. Paul—it is here alleged—must have been immediately justifying, if ever faith was: and yet, he must be baptized, and wash away his sins. (p. 265.) Undoubtedly he must! “Thy faith hath made thee whole,” was the language of our Lord to those who had believed in his power to heal them. But such would not have been his language, if the applicants had refused to do, or to attempt, whatever he commanded, as preliminary to their reception of the benefit. And thus it was with the apostle. Baptism was the appointed entrance into the justified state. But still it is true that his faith justified him. It is as if God said to all who come unto him: “Dost thou believe in the riches con-

"tained in my house? If thou dost, then take the key and unlock the gate."

Nothing can be more certainly true than what Mr. Newman himself has said—"What faith was, in the days of the Son of Man, for temporal blessings, surely it is, now, under the ministration of the Spirit, for heavenly blessings," (p. 268): and nothing, as it seems to us, can well be more destructive of his own position! For, assuredly, in the days of the Son of Man, the *faith* always preceded the *blessing*. "If thou canst believe—all things are possible to them that believe:" such was the language of the Son of Man, before he stretched out a hand, or spake a word, for the relief of the sufferer. And this is a type of the proceeding by which our souls are delivered from their moral distempers and infirmities.

But then we are told that "nothing is said of faith, before baptism, which is not said of repentance, or of restitution." (p. 275). Well—but still it may be asked, is justification ever connected with repentance, at any stage of the Christian course, as it is connected with faith? If it had been ever said that we are justified *by* repentance, or *through* repentance, should we not have concluded that repentance must have preceded justification—that it must have been an effective antecedent to baptism—that, in short, it was to do for us all that faith is now said to do? Besides—it is not very easy to imagine faith and repentance to be disjoined from each other. The believing sufferer would hardly apply to the Son of Man for health, if he were not oppressed with a sense of his diseases and infirmities. And, in the same manner, the believing sinner would never apply to the Great Physician of the soul, if he did not feel weary and heavy-laden with the weight of his transgressions. The faith which entitles a man to ask for baptism, must, from the nature of the case, be the faith of a penitent. People seldom ask for what they do not want, whatever may be their reliance on the kindness or the power of a benefactor. The case is simply this: A man is afflicted with the consciousness of infirmity and guilt. He *believes* that a fountain has been opened for sin and for uncleanness. And, in virtue of his belief, he is allowed to have access to the waters.

Mr. Newman, however, frequently reminds us that we *live* by faith. Unquestionably we do. We begin to live by it, and we continue to live by it. He, also, admonishes us that we *stand* by faith: and he asks, where was it ever said that we are to *rise up* by faith? We think we have read of something very like it! "Paul, stedfastly beholding the cripple, and perceiving that he had faith to be healed, said with a loud voice, stand upright on thy feet." (Acts, xiv. 9, 10.) And, Paul was here speaking in

the spirit and power of the Son of Man ; in whose days, as Mr. Newman has justly observed, what faith did for the mortal bodies of men, was analogous to that which, afterwards, it was to do for their immortal souls. But, again,—we are apprized, that “ the reception of grace is the prerogative of faith,” (p. 270,)—a proposition altogether undeniable, if broadly and comprehensively understood. By faith, we receive the initial grace or gift of justification : and, by faith, we continue to receive, from time to time, the benefits of justification, even to our life’s end. Once more—“ faith is the tenure on which we enjoy the gifts which Christ has merited for us.” (p. 280.) Even so it is : and under that same tenure it is, that we first enter upon the enjoyment. Lastly—“ faith heralds forth the grace of God.” (p. 279.) Indisputably, it does so. And this office, we contend, belongs to it from the very first. How can the grace of God be more fitly heralded, than by an open renunciation of human desert ? And does not the voice of faith proclaim this renunciation, when it craves admittance to a covenant, which, throughout, is established on the ground of God’s free mercy ? It is true that, when once admitted, the eye of faith may gradually become steadier and brighter, as the moral sensibility becomes more keen,—and the view of God’s attributes more distinct and overpowering,—and the extent of God’s mercies more perfectly revealed. The principle of faith, or trust, will then be more enlightened, more vivid, more deeply affectionate. The renunciation of self will grow constantly more passionate. The reliance on the blessed gift of an indwelling Saviour will perpetually be gaining intensity and power. In a word, faith will become more exalted and refined, and more fit for the lofty function to which it is promoted. The “ recipient of grace” will daily be increasing in capacity. Or (to return to Mr. Newman’s figure), the herald of grace will acquire a faculty of utterance, more and more worthy of its high and glorious theme. And, in all this, we can see nothing at variance with the truth, that the first dawnings of faith itself, must be ascribed to the power of God : for, to Him we must all write ourselves debtors for every movement of the heart or spirit, which may have a tendency to good. And, to those who may be conscious of any such movement, it may always be said,—who made thee to differ ?—what hast thou, which thou hast not received ? The Gospel, undoubtedly, will be preached in vain to the heathen, if He does not open their hearts. And, if there be some who believe, and some who believe not, nothing remains for us, but to ascribe the difference to God’s inscrutable election. But, be the origin of faith what it may, to faith is undoubtedly assigned the office of opening the kingdom of heaven to believers : that king-

dom into which the sacrament of regeneration is the ordained and lawful entrance.

That such was the view of those who framed our liturgy, appears to us beyond all dispute. In the office for baptism of adults, the preliminary exhortation contains these words;—
 “Doubt ye not, therefore, but earnestly believe, that He will favourably receive these present persons, truly repenting and coming unto him by faith; that He will grant them remission of their sins, and bestow upon them the Holy Ghost; that He will give them the blessing of eternal life, and make them partakers of His everlasting kingdom.” The language of the concluding address is in harmony with the exhortation;—“As for you, who have now, by baptism, put on Christ, it is your part and duty also, by being made the children of God and of the light, by faith in Jesus Christ, to walk answerably to your Christian calling, and as becometh the children of light.” This language may, doubtless, be resolutely explained away; and the faith to which it adverts, may be degraded into a mere condition, a *sine quâ non*; or, negatively, into the mere absence of positive disqualification. But, be it what it may, it is evidently something which is honoured by great and precious promises; something, too, (by Mr. Newman’s own concession), which indicates a habit, or a state of mind, the same in kind, if not the same in degree, with that which follows upon baptism, and perpetuates the blessing. It may not, indeed, be, then, the same vigorous and lively principle which it may afterwards become, when the gift of the Spirit has been actually bestowed. But, still, it is the same principle in a rudimental state and form. It is something which is essential to all religion; and which, by its very nature, is fitted to be the nucleus and germ of all spiritual excellence. And, for this reason, we may humbly and reverentially presume, it has been so highly favoured by Him to whom all religion looks.

So much, for the baptism of adults. The case of infants, indeed, bears a different aspect. And, if we had been left, solely, to the guidance of our own judgment, we might, *perhaps*, have been induced to think, that the whole spirit and design of the Gospel would have been better consulted, and more consistently followed out, by leaving our children in the state of catechumens, until they should be of age to make a profession of faith for themselves. The Church, however, has interpreted the mind of the Spirit, by her immemorial practice. On the one hand, she accepted the faith of the catechumen, who might chance to die before baptism could be administered. And, on the other hand, she has always received into her bosom those who are too young for repentance or belief, and has accepted a vicarious pro-

fession of faith, on their behalf: even as our blessed Lord himself was pleased to heal the helpless paralytic, when he saw the faith of those who brought him to be healed. But, even in so doing, she manifestly recognizes the *general* principle, that belief is a necessary antecedent; and declares that two things are properly requisite in them that are *to be* baptized,—“repentance, whereby they forsake sin; and faith, whereby they stedfastly believe the promises of God.”

The twelfth of Mr. Newman's lectures is devoted to a comparison of St. Paul and St. James. We really have no space for the hitherto interminable controversy which has arisen out of their *apparently* conflicting averments. Our own impressions, respecting this debateable matter, will be best conveyed by putting an imaginary case. Let us, then, suppose a moral teacher, or monitor, to be in conference with a man of lofty pretensions, and of very mean performances. We may easily conceive that he might address his slippery and doubleminded hearer, in the following manner:—“Do not talk to me of your benevolent sentiments, and the tenderness of your heart. Show me the hungry that you have helped to feed, the naked that you have helped to clothe, the afflicted that you have helped to console. Then, and not till then, will it be credible, that you have any part or lot in the blessedness which is promised to the merciful.”—Or, again,—“Do not tell me of your penitential prostration of heart. Let me see the works that are meet for repentance. Let me see the reformation of your life, the abandonment of your vices, the steady pursuit of all that is honest and lovely and of good report. For, assuredly, nothing short of this will be accepted or endured by Him, whose delight it is to dwell in the hearts of the lowly and the contrite.” Or, once more,—“Do not talk to me of your trust in the mercies of God, and the merits of your Redeemer. The mercies of God are outraged, and the merits of the Redeemer horribly abused, when the triumphs of faith are proclaimed by unrighteous lips. The faith of Abraham, and the Patriarchs, manifested itself in a course of hard obedience. And, when you conform yourself to their example, and shew forth your faith by deeds which savour of rectitude and holiness, then may you stand justified in the sight of God and man. The faith which has no works to show, is a cold, lifeless, barren thing. It is unworthy of the name of faith. The faith which justifies, is capable of action, and ready for action. It can never leave the soul in a state of moral apathy; for its eye is directed towards Him who loveth righteousness and hateth iniquity. Its meditations are upon that dreadful sacrifice, by which alone His justice and His mercy could be reconciled.

“ The very things with which it is most conversant, speak, aw-
“ fully and sternly, of the hatefulness of sin. He, therefore, who
“ dares to affirm that he is walking by faith, while he is not care-
“ ful to walk in the ways of obedience, stands manifestly convicted
“ as a hypocrite.” Now this, as it appears to us, is precisely the
spirit of the Apostle’s warm and artless remonstrance with
them that boasted of their faith. And, most assuredly, he seems
utterly unconscious of any discrepancy between his own admoni-
tion, and the doctrine of St. Paul: for, like St. Paul, he illus-
trates his positions by reference to the case of Abraham. It is
irresistibly obvious, however, that his rebuke was directed against
persons who had shamefully perverted and abused the doctrine of
his brother Apostle. St. Paul had told the Jews that they could
never be justified by the works of the law; that is, by their own
doings under the law; and this, for the simple reason, that no
man had ever perfectly obeyed the law, or ever would. They
must therefore resort, with entire and unreserved confidence, to
another and better dispensation. And, their faith in that dispen-
sation would justify and save them; seeing that their faith was
the only thing required for their introduction to the blessings of
God’s new Covenant; the only thing, too, which could, instru-
mentally, secure them in the enjoyment of those blessings. St.
James, on the other hand, protests against the notion that the
faith inculcated by St. Paul, was a principle which left men at
liberty to sin, in order that grace might abound. And accord-
ingly, he declares that Christian men cannot be saved by faith
alone, without works; that is, by a faith without signs of life.
They must show forth their faith by their works. Nay—they
must be justified by works,—in other words, by faith in action.

According to the foregoing view of the matter, it may, in a
very safe and warrantable sense, be affirmed that the Christian is
justified by his strivings after integrity of life; and this, without
the slightest invasion of the prerogative of faith, as the sole justi-
fying qualification. It might be very properly maintained that
fidelity and allegiance are the qualities which alone can recom-
mend a man to the distinguished favour of his sovereign; and
yet it might, with equal propriety, be affirmed, in the same breath,
that the way to honour and reward is through a course of brave
and steady service. In this respect, faith resembles loyalty. It
must be prepared to labour, if it would earn its crown: although
the crown may be far too precious for any personal desert to
claim. And, to shrink from this statement, is to betray a most
unworthy prostration of mind before the authority of that imperi-
ous edict, which declares that justification by faith, and by faith
only, is the article of a standing or a falling Church. This is

just one of those sayings, in which the whole spirit of a revolution is frequently embodied. Such maxims, even when they express a truth, are pretty sure to do the work of error; for they present the truth under one aspect only; and, upon that one aspect, they fix exclusively the attention of the beholder; so that, when any other *phase* is exhibited, it wears the appearance of falsehood and delusion. We conceive it to be highly probable, that, if Christendom had been afflicted for centuries by the Antinomian perversion, instead of the Romish superstitions and corruptions, justification by works would have been set up, as the test, whereby to ascertain the Church's stability or decline.

In the midst of all the darkness that has gathered round this question, one thing, at least, is clear and bright: a day will come, when men shall be judged according to their works; and, when their works shall be judged according to their motives. And, of all the motives by which men can be impelled, what motive can be imagined so powerful, as an habitual persuasion that the perfections of the Deity are truly revealed to us in the Gospel Dispensation? In that day, we shall be dealt with, according to what we shall be found *to be*; and so, it may truly be said, that the Christian will then stand justified by his faith; seeing that faith is the only habit of mind in which acceptable works can be performed by him. But, we shall also be dealt with, according to what we *have done*. And so, it may be likewise said that, by our works shall we be justified, and by our works shall we be condemned.

A good deal of the perplexity by which the subject has been overwhelmed seems to have arisen from the difficulty of furnishing a definition of justifying faith, sufficiently precise to satisfy a philosophical inquirer. What—it may be asked—is this mighty principle, which is said to be so fruitful in wonders? And, since it might be no easy matter to frame such an answer to this question, as might be altogether safe from captious objections, divines have, naturally enough, been often tempted to describe faith, by an appeal to its effects; just as the metaphysicians are compelled to define substances by an enumeration of their respective qualities or accidents. We, accordingly, find that Mr. Newman himself is content to avow that, after all,—“We know not what faith is, in itself; we know it only in its results. Relatively to us, it exists *only* in its results,” (p. 337.) And, in the same spirit, our Article compares it to a tree, the quality of which is to be known by its fruits. We may be mistaken in our endeavours to define or to describe the peculiar vegetative principle of the plant. But we can scarcely be mistaken in our estimate

of the produce. Now,—(to borrow the language and illustration of Dr. Hey):—

“ It will seldom happen, that we need go deeper than this ; yet, to say the truth, we may sometimes be driven, by obstinate cavilling, to descend one step farther. If a man will not be contented with the rational account now given, but will still persist in saying, you take your *idea* of faith, not from *faith itself*, but from some *effects* of what you describe and define ; the answer *then* must be, *all active principles*, such is the confined knowledge of man, may, in some cases, oblige us to have recourse to their *effects*, merely to describe or define them.—What is *gunpowder* ? at first we only, in answer, define gunpowder by its *ingredients* ; nitre, with a little sulphur and charcoal : this will generally serve to describe, or define, gunpowder. But suppose you try this composition, and it makes no *explosion* ?—then you say, immediately, this is not *right* gunpowder : what ? did it not answer to your definition ? I do not care how it was mixed, says a plain man, but I am sure, that it is not right gunpowder, which will not go off when you touch it with fire. And some inquisitive spectators might go farther, and say, perhaps the *nitre* was not *right* nitre, nor the *sulphur* right sulphur, &c. and then our difficulties multiply upon us. Here is, no doubt, a perplexity ; we have not determinate ideas ; but yet the perplexity is one, under which we should make ourselves very *easy*, as a matter of speculation ; and for practice, we should contrive the best *methods* we could, to *cure* our gunpowder ; but we should never rest contented till it had its usual *effects*. Nor is there any good reason why perplexity should occasion greater uneasiness, if we were obliged to quit our definition of faith, and say, this is not *right* faith, because it has not the right *effects* of faith.”—vol. iii. p. 353.

If the reader is not weary of illustrations, we would venture on one more.—A man afflicted with a mortal disease resorts to a physician endowed with supernatural gifts of healing, who declares that a full reliance on his power and good will is indispensably requisite for the cure. The sufferer protests that he has this feeling. The word is spoken ; and the man is healed. But, the physician then adds,—“ The danger is now over. The
“ venom of the plague is gone. Nevertheless, the disorder has
“ left you miserably weak. Your perfect establishment in health
“ and strength will be a work of time. There still must be care
“ and vigilance. There must be air, and exercise, and regularity.
“ Your constitution will resent neglect or violence : and, if these
“ should be long continued, your relapse may probably be fatal.
“ You declared your entire confidence in me, previously to your
“ cure. You must, now, show the sincerity and strength of that
“ reliance, by strictly following my directions. If your faith
“ should fail so to manifest itself, you are lost.” Now, it is true

that, in a case like this, the patient would be healed, and finally set up, entirely by the power and goodness of the physician. And yet it might, also, be truly said that he was preserved solely by his faith; seeing that his faith was the one thing needful to call the power of the physician into action. And, lastly, it might be affirmed, without the slightest inconsistency, that the man was carried through by his own obedience to orders; that obedience being the result of his submissive reliance on the consummate wisdom and benignity of his preserver. And is it not even thus with our spiritual malady, and our deliverance from it? The Christian is saved entirely by the power and benevolence of the Great Physician. He is, also, instrumentally, saved by the faith which commended him to the good offices of his gracious benefactor. And yet, without any contradiction, it may further be asserted, that he is finally saved by his *faithful* adherence to the holy regimen and discipline, which the same Physician has prescribed.

We have left ourselves but small space for remark on the volume of Mr. Faber. We protest, however, against the suspicion that our brevity is an indication of scanty respect for his labours. His services to the cause of the Catholic verity are notorious and manifold. They are such as must always entitle him to an honourable rank in the goodly company of Anglican divines. But his appeal to Catholic antiquity, for the settlement of the questions now before us, appears to us considerably less satisfactory than those, by which he has aided to confirm our faith in the Trinity, and to fix the true doctrine of election. He has produced, indeed, a copious series of quotations from seventeen of the Fathers, beginning with Clement of Rome, and ending with Bernard of Clairvaux; for the purpose of establishing the doctrine of *forensic* justification, in opposition to the Romish doctrine of righteousness inherent and infused. But, in the first place, we must confess that certain of these passages appear to us to be not altogether conclusive of the matter in debate. And, secondly, —if we are to judge by the vast variety of citations which the agitation of this question has called up from time to time—it would be no easy matter to ascertain, with entire distinctness and precision, the vein of thought which runs through this region of the primitive theology. Our *impression* is, that the Romanist and the Protestant might assail each other with sayings and sentences from the Fathers, to the end of time, without much prospect of a decisive victory on either side. To our ears, their trumpet seems, for the most part, to render an uncertain sound. And the reason for this is intelligible enough. They did not use the trumpet, to blow upon it certain *points of war*. In their days no formal controversy had arisen upon the subject, at all similar to

that by which Christendom was agitated in the 16th century. And, therefore, they frequently expressed themselves in a manner comparatively artless and untechnical. Relative to one matter, indeed, they were clear and decided,—that we are debtors for every spiritual blessing to the free grace and unbought mercy of God. But, as Barrow observes, “they did consider *distinctly* “no such point as justification; looking upon that word as used “in Scripture, for the expression of points *more* clearly expressed “in other terms. Wherefore, they do not make much use of the “word, as some divines now do.”* So that we almost despair of seeing the question brought speedily to issue by an appeal to their testimony.

We are under the necessity of leaving our readers to examine the authorities brought forward by Mr. Faber, and to estimate for themselves the weight of those authorities. Perhaps the very earliest of them,—that of Clement,—is among the strongest that can be produced. And yet the value of his testimony depends chiefly upon the sense we are to attach to the words, οὐ δι' ἑαυτῶν δικαιούμεθα, οὐδὲ διὰ τῆς ἡμετέρας σοφίας, ἢ συνέσεως, ἢ εὐσεβείας, ἢ ἔργων ὧν κατειργασάμεθα ἐν ὁσιότητι καρδίας, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς πίστεως. Now Mr. Faber contends that, by “works which we did in holiness of heart,” we must, indisputably, understand works performed after the infusion of holiness into the heart by the gracious Spirit; which works are, yet, carefully shut out by Clement from the office of justifying. And such undoubtedly *may* have been the meaning of the writer. But it is very far from being certain that such *was* his meaning. For, first, “works done in holiness of heart,” may be nothing more than a periphrastic form of expression, denoting holy works, or works done with pious intent; and indicating nothing determinate respecting the state or condition in which the works are done. Besides, the averment of the father may amount to no more than this, that we are not justified by holy works,—seeing that we have no such performances to show. And, further, Mr. Newman has produced certain other expressions from the very same writer, which seem pretty nearly to neutralize the force of that passage upon which Mr. Faber so confidently relies. (Newm. Append. p. 436, &c.)

After all, however, Mr. Faber is to be regarded rather as the antagonist of Alexander Knox, than of Mr. Newman. In grappling with Knox, he evidently considers himself as, in effect, grappling with the Tridentine Divines; whose system of an inherent righteousness,—of a moral quality infused into the soul,—Knox endeavoured to revive; though with an anxious disclaimer of all righteousness truly and formally meritorious. Now

* Barrow, Sermon on Justification.

Mr. Newman, as we have seen, contends for no infusion of a moral quality. What he does contend for, is, the inward presence of Christ in the soul, as the formal cause of our *justification*; under which term he comprises all the gifts and blessings of the renovated state: not only the remission of sins, but also, every thing which is usually contemplated by those, who speak in the loftiest and most vivid terms of the righteousness of *sanctification*. And,—after the most careful thought that we are capable of giving to the subject,—the conviction still returns upon us, that, as between him and Mr. Faber, the dispute will be found to resolve itself principally into a question respecting the fit application of a word. At all events, we do ardently hope, for the honour of our common Christianity, that we shall hear nothing, from any quarter, that sounds like fierce denunciation against Mr. Newman, as an abettor of Popery, and a traitor to the Reformation! We earnestly deprecate all such disgraceful eruptions of ferocious panic. If there be any, who should be smitten with alarm, lest the doctrine of meritorious righteousness should, here, be creeping back among us, in disguise,—let them give a patient and candid hearing to the following words: and then let them ask themselves whether they can find in Mr. Newman's teaching, any reasonable cause to fear the revival of that awful perversion:

“ I say, the view of justification taken by Romanists and by a school of divines among ourselves, tends to fix the mind on self, not on Christ, whereas that which I have advocated as Scriptural and Catholic, buries self in the absorbing vision of a present, an indwelling God. And as so doing, it is a more awakening and fearful doctrine even, than that mode of teaching, which insists mainly and directly on our responsibilities and duties. For to what does it point as the great and immediate condition of justification? to faith and holiness of our own? or, on the other hand, to the mere title of righteousness, which cannot be literally approached or profaned by us? no,—but to the glorious Shekinah of the Word Incarnate, as to the true wedding garment in which the soul must be dressed. Does not such a view far increase, instead of diminishing our responsibilities? does it not make us more watchful and more obedient, while it comforts and transports us? Surely it takes our minds off ourselves in order to fill us with triumph, awe, and godly fear at what we are and what we hold within us. When are we the more likely to dread sinning, when we know merely we ought to dread it, or when we see the exceeding peril of it? When are we the more likely to keep awake and be sober, when we have a present treasure now to lose, or a distant reward to gain? Is it not more dreadful, when evil thoughts assail us, more elevating and ennobling in affliction, more kindling in danger and hardship, to reflect (if the words may be said), that we bear God within us, as the Martyr Ignatius expresses it, that He is grieved by us, or suffers with us according as we carry or renounce His Cross,—

I say has not this thought more of persuasiveness in it to do and suffer for Him, than the views of doctrine which have spread among us ? is it not more constraining than that which considers that the Gospel comes to us in name, not in power ; deeper, and more sacred than a second, which makes its heavenly grace a matter of purchase and trade ; more glowing than a third, which depresses it almost to the chill temperature of natural religion.”—pp. 220, 221.

We cannot close our notice of Mr. Newman's volume without soliciting the attention of the reader to the following noble and elevating passage. The extract is somewhat of the longest. But we scruple not to insert it : for,—(whatever may be the variety of opinion respecting the general merit or demerit of Mr. Newman's theological statements),—this extract cannot fail to show that his heart, and all his faculties, are thoroughly pervaded by the spirit of apostolic piety :

“ The Gospel, then, is specially the system of faith and ‘ the law of faith,’ and its obedience is the ‘ obedience of faith,’ and its justification is ‘ by faith,’ and it is a ‘ power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth,’ as contrasted to all religious systems which have gone before and come after, even those in which God has spoken. For at the time of its first preaching, the Jews went by sight and the Gentiles by reason ; both might believe, but on a belief resolvable into sight or reason, neither went simply by faith. The Greeks sought after ‘ wisdom,’ some original and recondite philosophy, which might serve as an ‘ evidence’ or ground of proof for ‘ things not seen.’ The Jews, on the other hand, ‘ required a sign,’ some sensible display of God's power, a thing of sight and touch, which might be ‘ the substance,’ the earnest and security ‘ of things hoped for.’ They wanted some carnal and immediate good, as ‘ the praise of men ;’ for this they did their alms, fasted, and prayed, not looking on to witnesses unseen, but for an earthly reward ; or, if they wrought for God, it was in a grudging, calculating way, as if to make their services go as far as possible, resting in them as ends, and suspicious of God as of a hard or unjust Master. Such was the state of the world, when it pleased Almighty God, in furtherance of His plan of mercy, to throw men's minds upon the next world without any other direct medium of evidence than the word of man claiming to be His ; to change the face of the world by what the world called ‘ the foolishness of preaching’ and the unreasoning zeal and obstinacy of faith, using a principle in truth's behalf which in the world's evil history has ever been the spring of great events and strange achievements. Faith, which in the natural man has manifested itself in the fearful energy of superstition and fanaticism, is in the Gospel grafted on the love of God, and made to mould the heart of man into His image.

“ The Apostles then proceeded thus :—they did not rest their cause on argument ; they did not appeal to eloquence, wisdom, or reputation ; nay, nor did they make miracles necessary to the enforcement of their claims. They did not resolve faith into sight or reason ; they contrasted it with both, and bade their hearers believe, sometimes in spite, sometimes in default, sometimes in aid of sight and reason. They exhorted

them to make trial of the Gospel, since they would find their account in so doing. And of their hearers 'some believed the things which were spoken, some believed not.' Those believed whose hearts were 'opened,' who were 'ordained to eternal life;' those did not whose hearts were hardened. This was the awful exhibition of which the Apostles and their fellow workers were witnesses; for faith, as a principle of knowledge, cannot be analyzed or made intelligible to man, but is the secret, inexplicable, spontaneous movement of the mind (however arising), towards the external word,—a movement not to the exclusion of sight and reason, for the miracles appeal to both, nor of experience, for all who venture for Christ receive daily returns of good in confirmation of their choice, but independent of sight or reason before, or of experience after. The Apostles appealed to their hearts, and, according to their hearts, so they answered them. They appealed to their secret belief in a superintending providence, in their hopes and fears thence resulting; and they professed to reveal to them the nature, personality, attributes, will, and works of Him "whom they ignorantly worshipped." They came as commissioned from Him, and declared that mankind was a sinful and outcast race,—that sin was a misery,—that the world was a snare,—that life was a shadow,—that God was everlasting,—that His Law was holy and true, and its sanctions certain and terrible;—that He also was all merciful,—that He had appointed a Mediator between Him and them, who had removed all obstacles, and was desirous to restore them, and that He had sent them to explain how. They said that Mediator had come and gone; but had left behind Him what was to be His representative till the end of all things, His mystical Body, the Church, in joining which lay the salvation of the world. Thus they preached, and thus they prevailed, using persuasives of every kind as they were given them, but resting at bottom on a principle higher than the senses or the reason. They used many arguments, but as outward forms of something beyond argument. They appealed to the miracles they wrought, as sufficient signs of their power, and assuredly divine, in spite of those which other systems could show or pretended. They expostulated with the better sort on the ground of their instinctive longings and dim visions of something greater than the world. They awed and overcame the wayward, by the secret influence of what remained of heaven in them, and the involuntary homage paid by such to any more complete realizing of it in others. They asked the more generous-minded whether it was not worth while to risk something on the chance of augmenting and perfecting those precious elements of good which their hearts still held; and they could not hide what they cared not to 'glory in,' their own disinterested sufferings, their high deeds, and their sanctity of life. They won over the affectionate and gentle by the beauty of holiness, and the embodied mercies of Christ as seen in their ministrations and ordinances. Thus they spread their nets for disciples, and caught thousands at a cast; thus they roused and inflamed their hearers into enthusiasm, till 'the Kingdom of Heaven suffered violence, and the violent took it by force.' And when these had entered it, many, doubtless, would wax cold in love, and fall away; for many have entered only

on impulse ; many, with Simon Magus, on wonder or curiosity ; many from a mere argumentative belief, which leads as readily into heresy as into the Truth. But still, those who had the seed of God within them, would become neither offences in the Church, nor apostates, nor heretics ; but would find day by day, as love increased, increasing experience that what they had ventured boldly amid conflicting evidence, of sight against sight, and reason against reason, with some things for it, and many things against it, they had ventured well. The examples of meekness, cheerfulness, contentment, silent endurance, private self-denial, fortitude, brotherly love, perseverance in well doing, which would from time to time meet them in their new kingdom,—the sublimity and harmony of the Church's doctrine,—the touching and subduing beauty of her services and appointments,—their consciousness of her virtue, divinely conveyed, upon themselves in subduing, purifying, changing them,—the bountifulness of her alms-giving,—her power, weak as she was and despised, over the statesmen and philosophers of the world,—her consistent and steady aggression upon it, moving forward in spite of it on all sides at once, like the wheels in the Prophet's vision, and this contrasted to the ephemeral and variable outbreaks of sectarianism,—the unanimity and intimacy existing between her widely separated branches,—the mutual sympathy and correspondence of men of hostile nations and foreign languages,—the simplicity of her ascetics, the gravity of her Bishops, the awful glory shed around her Martyrs, and the mysterious and recurring traces of miraculous agency here and there, once and again, according as the Spirit willed,—these and the like persuasives acted on them day by day, turning the whisper of their hearts into an habitual conviction, and establishing in the reason what had been begun in the will. And thus has the Church been upheld ever since, by an appeal to the people,—to the necessities of human nature, the anxieties of conscience, and the instincts of purity ; forcing upon kings a sufferance or protection which they fain would dispense with, and upon philosophy a grudging submission and a reserved and limited recognition.

“Such was the triumph of Faith, spreading like a leaven through the thoughts, words, and works of men, till the whole was leavened. It did not affect the substance of religion ; it left unaltered both its external developements and its inward character ; but it gave strength and direction to its lineaments. The sacrifice of prayer and praise, and the service of an obedient heart and life, remained as essential as before ; but it has infused a principle of growth. It has converted grovelling essays into high aspirings—partial glimpses into calm contemplation,—niggard payments into generous self-devotion. It enjoined the law of love for retaliation ; it put pain above enjoyment ; it supplanted polygamy by the celibate ; it honoured poverty before affluence, the communion of saints before the civil power, the next world before this. It made the Christian independent of all men and all things, except of Christ ; and provided for a deeper humility, while it abounded in peace and joy.”—p. 306—313.

ART. IV.—*Memoir of the Rev. H. Martyn.* By the Rev. John Sargent, late Rector of Lavington. Sussex. Tenth edition. 1830.

2. *Journals and Letters of the Rev. H. Martyn.* Edited by Rev. S. Wilberforce, Rector of Brighstone. 1837.

WE feel it necessary to give some explanation of our prefixing to this article the title of the *Memoir of the Rev. H. Martyn*, a book already so well known, and so often made the subject of review. Of its deeply affecting character, and its high excellence as a composition, no other witness is needed than the remarkable sale of ten editions. Well known as the memoir is already, we have nevertheless thought it right to bring it again before our readers, in the new relation it occupies to the mass of Mr. Martyn's private journals and correspondence, in which are letters on the subject of his last and greatest trial, now edited for the first time. The two works are in many ways necessary to each other. The *Memoir* gives to the *Journals*, which are unavoidably broken and disconnected, a definite outline, and continuity; and the *Journals* supply to the *Memoir* a complement of the most private and interesting matter, which could not by any means be wrought into it, without breaking the thread of the narration. Many large and valuable passages, already published in the *Memoir*, are omitted in the later publication, and the reader is referred for them to the earlier. We may, therefore, regard them as integral parts of one very extended and minute piece of biography.

High as Mr. Martyn's name has ever stood, the portion of his journals and correspondence contained in the second volume have raised him in our estimation to a still higher place. In the *Memoir* we see, as it were at a glance, the whole earthly transit of a most holy, humble, self-renouncing servant of God; in the *Journals* we are admitted into the full privacy of his inmost conflict. Every passage of his warfare expands out of proportion with the beautiful outline, so admirably and unerringly kept in the original *Memoir*, as the near observation of objects deranges the keeping of a remoter view, while they severally become in turn sufficient to occupy the whole field of sight. In this way, we have found the several features of Mr. Martyn's character grow upon us, with a kind of ever-varying aspect presenting new difficulties, trials and disappointments, sometimes operating singly, sometimes in combination, and ever resulting in a full and well-earned mastery. But before we make any remarks in detail upon the character of Mr. Martyn as now exhibited to us, it will be right to state very shortly the outline of his life.

He was born at Truro in 1781, and received his early education at the grammar school in that town. In 1797, he commenced his residence at St. John's College, Cambridge. In the year 1801 he took his degree, attaining at the same time the highest academical honour, that of senior wrangler. In the same year, he made the resolution of dedicating himself to the work of a missionary; and in 1803, he received deacon's orders. Soon after this, he was appointed, by the East India Company, to a chaplaincy in India, and, having been admitted to the priesthood in the year 1805, he sailed, on the 17th of July, for India. The ship reached Calcutta in April, 1806. Mr. Martyn's first station was at Dinapore: in 1809, he was removed to Cawnpore: from thence he went, in the year 1811, to Shiraz, for the purpose of completing a translation of the New Testament in the Persian language. After a severe and dangerous illness at Tebriz, he resolved to return, by way of Constantinople, to England. He reached no further than Tocat, and there died, Oct. 16, 1812, in the thirty-second year of his age.

Now if we should attempt a delineation of Mr. Martyn's character, of his high and cultivated intellectual powers, of the stern subjection in which he held the faculties of the pure intellect to the supremacy of the moral sense, by how sharp a discipline the particular affections of his mind were reined in at the bidding of a conscience rendered severe and sensitive by the mingled habits of yearning aspiration, and of deep abasement;—and, besides all this, with how warm and ready a flow of natural affection he applied himself at one time to the discharge of the lowliest pastoral care, and at another to the offices of brotherly attachment;—if we should attempt to delineate a character of such variety and singular excellence, we must write, not a review, but a memoir.

Holding ourselves, therefore, discharged, by the necessity of the case, from the suspicion of slighting so bright an example by a cursory notice, we shall attempt no more than to point out what seem to us the prominent features of Mr. Martyn's character. And these appear to be intense habitual devotion, and an absolute dedication of himself to the service of our Heavenly Master.

Of his intense habits of devotion the two volumes of his Journals bear one unbroken testimony. It would appear that his early life was both amiable and exemplary, but exhibited no energetic signs of a deeper seriousness. The death of his father in 1800, was, it seems, the turning point of his character, and the occasion of his first more defined religious impressions. From that time, the substance of religion became the matter of his most

attentive thoughts. He commenced his journals about the year 1802, of which habit he has recorded the following account.

“ I am convinced that Christian experience in general is not a delusion. Whether mine is or not will be seen at the last day. My object in making this Journal is to accustom myself to self-examination, to give my experience a visible form so as to leave an impression on the memory, and so to improve my soul in holiness : for the review of such a lasting testimony, will serve the double end of conviction and consolation. I pretend not to record all that I remember, and that not on account of its minuteness, for nothing is strictly so, but because in some cases it would be improper to commit it to paper. I desire to collect the *habit* of my mind, to discover my besetting sins, the occasion of calling them forth, and the considerations, by which I have been at any time stirred up to duty. May God, in his mercy, save me from the delusions of my deceitful heart, and pardon the indifference with which I speak and think of sin, and of this record, which may be of everlasting importance to my soul.”*

From this time we find a record of his daily life, of actions and words, of temptations and falls, of purposes half formed, and faults half consented in, of feelings, and very thoughts, and even of their alternations, and transitory forms, kept with a scrutiny so close and unsparing, that we can liken it to nothing but the finest observation of an ever-varying thermometer. We are amazed at the precision with which he seemed to fix and register the most fleeting imaginations. It is certainly a sufficient proof of his sincerity in saying that in self-examination nothing is strictly *minute*. The whole aspect of the Journals, especially the earlier part, reminds us of the following remarkable passage :

“ The intellectual heart, the spirit and soul of man, is the fountain and source of all action. This is that which understands and wills, loves and hates. Here are all the springs and powers of life and motion ; here is the last resort of all outward impressions, and from this central point are derived all the lines of action and motion, even as all the arteries and veins are from the natural heart, which it diffuses and disperses throughout the body, and has its pulses in every part. If, therefore, this general spring-head be not kept pure and clean, how can the streams run clear ? And upon this, was grounded that signal advice of the wise man, Prov. iv. 23, ‘ Keep thy heart with all diligence, for out of it are the issues of life.’ Parallel to which I find a passage in the Meditations of the Royal Philosopher, Marcus Antoninus, ἐνδον βλέπε, ἐνδον ἡ πηγή τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ,—look within, for within is the fountain of good. Further yet this intellectual heart is always beating, the pulses of it never rest ; thought rises upon thought, and desire succeeds desire. The motion is perpetual, constant, and vehement ; so vehement, that the swiftest bodily motion, no, not that of the starry orb, is comparable to

* Journals, vol. i. p. 52.

it ; so vehement that it cannot be discerned or numbered, and comes nearer to a rest than to a motion, as the swiftest turnings round of a globe look like standing still. Now what a dangerous thing is such a motion as this, if not rightly determined ! Of what vast heights in goodness is it capable ! And to what vast heights of wickedness may it rise if not well governed."*

That in this inward scrutiny we are liable to deceive ourselves, is only to bring the prophet's† warning to bear on the particular subject of self-examination. The dangers besetting this duty are not simply those of self-deceit in its ordinary sense, i. e. the too favourable interpretation of our own faults, or the unconsciousness of their existence, but of a more subtle kind. A mirror is a necessary instrument, but may become a snare. Self-examination may insensibly become a self-contemplative habit. In such a mind as Mr. Martyn's it could not feed the lighter and vainer passions, which are ever uppermost in listless and shallow men. In him there was no such pabulum to fasten on. The form it would rather take with his keener and speculative mind would be that of attempting to ascertain the gradual accessions of energy to the habits of the soul, by acts of *direct intuition*. Although it is true that no man "knoweth the things of a man save the spirit of a man that is within him," yet the question returns, *how* is he to know them ? Are not the healthy energies of the mind to be perceived as the healthy energies of the body, not by direct intuition, for which we have no faculties, but by their sensible effects ? Perhaps self-examination can hardly extend beyond the noting of *faults*, without endangering the character by self-elation, or morbid depression, or by referring to the agency of God, what is in fact no more than the movements of the animal spirit. That Mr. Martyn was aware of this we have his own witness in the following very solemn passage in a letter, written the year before his death, "I have been often deceived in times past, and erroneously called animal spirits joy in the Holy Ghost."‡ We think we can trace a marked difference in the tone of his Journals written in England, where the calls upon his attention and labour, although many and various, were thrown off with ease, and that of his diary kept during the voyage, but most of all during his residence in India and Persia, when his mind was intensely concentrated on external objects, such as the unremitting work of translating Holy Scripture. He lost not a shade of his fervent devotional spirit, while his mind was braced up to a healthier tone. The urgent demands of duty, and the calm contemplation of his Master's example, corrected

* Norris on the Sixth Beatitude. St. Matth. v. 8.

† 1 Jerem. xvii. 9.

‡ Journals, &c. vol. ii. 325.

without relaxing anything of his inward self-examination, the tendency of his mind to a somewhat morbid introversion upon itself.

This unsparing habit of recording against himself the faults of his daily life, was the secret force which threw out his system of self-discipline. From the earliest time of his deeper seriousness, his days were distributed into seasons of prayer, the frequency and duration of which are such as we seldom meet with in modern biographies. We find in his Journals passages such as the following: "I rather think a regular distribution of the day for prayer to obtain the three great graces of humility, love, and resignation would be far the best way to grow in them."* "When I got to my room I continued about two hours in prayer."† Then in a few pages we find him reading and praying with his college servant. To these devotional acts must of course be added the blessed daily service of the college chapel, and frequently of the parish churches in Cambridge, where he was wont to attend, and often to officiate. When with these habitual exercises we mix up the labours of a tutor and of a close and diligent student, we are reminded of the biographies of earlier and better days of our Holy Mother, when her sons were wont for themselves to break their days into canonical hours. "Besides occasional and supernumerary addresses," we read of one who is a worthy type of our catholicism, his certain perpetual returns exceeded David's seven times a day. As soon as he was ready (which was usually early) he prayed in his chamber with his servant, in a peculiar form composed for that purpose. After this he retired to his own more secret devotions in his closet. Betwixt ten and eleven in the morning he had a solemn intercession in reference to the national calamities; to this, after a little distance, succeeded the morning office of the Church, which he particularly desired to perform in his own person, and would by no means accept the ease of having it read by any other. In the afternoon he had another hour of private prayer, which on Sundays he enlarged, and so religiously observed that if any necessary business or charity had diverted him at the usual time, he repaired his soul at the cost of his body, and notwithstanding the injunction of his physicians, which in other cases he was careful to obey, spent the supper time therein. About five of the clock the solemn private prayers for the nation, and the evening service of the Church, returned. At bed-time his private prayers closed the day; and after all, even the night was not without its office, the 51st Psalm being his designed midnight entertainment. In his prayers, as his

* Journal, i. 60.

† Ibid. 187.

attention was fixed and steady, so was it inflamed with passionate fervour, insomuch that very frequently his transport threw him prostrate on the earth; his tears also would interrupt his words; the latter happening not only upon the pungent exigencies of present or impending judgments, but in the common service of the Church.* To these seasons of prayer Mr. Martyn added also frequent fasts, both as an ordinary means for the chastening and purifying of his mind, and also from time to time as a special check and counteraction to other and lower influences, which seemed to him to withdraw it from habitual consciousness of things unseen.

"I have declined so sensibly," he writes in one place, "these last two or three days, that I design to devote to-morrow to fasting and prayer."† "Oh that I had a more piercing sense of the divine presence. How much sin in the purest services. If I were sitting in heavenly places with Christ, or rather with my thoughts habitually there, how would every duty become easy! . . . 'Memoria tua sancta et dulcedo tua beatissima possideat animam meam, atque in invisibilium amorem rapiat illam.' This day was set apart for a public fast. I prayed rather more than two hours, chiefly with confession of my own sins, those of my family, and the church; alas so much was required to be said on the first head, that I should have been at no loss to have dwelt upon it the whole day."‡

Such were Mr. Martyn's habits of self-discipline at the time when he resolved to dedicate himself to the work of a missionary. We cannot but think that such a resolution involved, in his case, a greater sacrifice of self than it would in the case of most men.

It would appear that his health had been delicate from childhood; and that in his family was the sad heir-loom of a consumptive tendency. Without doubt the unobserved resistance of an unkindly constitution is often the too stubborn hindrance, and always the severe antagonist, of self-discipline, and habitual striving after high measures of perfection. From the time of taking his degree, he had frequent indications of secret disease, which, after he had entered upon his life of hardship, gave no ambiguous warnings. "O my dearest S—," he wrote, in 1809, to his only surviving sister, who, it seems, did not live to receive his letter, "that disease which preyed upon our mother, and dear sister, and has often shown itself in me, has, I fear, attacked you."—*Memoir*, p. 320. This question must therefore have entered into the deliberate consideration of his future course, and must have been deliberately disregarded.

* Bishop Fell's Life of Hammond, 28, fol.

† Journals, 1, 187.

‡ Memoir, 51.

There were other influences which might have made any ordinary man relax from his purpose of self-devotion. He had a very pure delight in letters and science, the highest academical distinction had been awarded to him. He could not have been unconscious that the largest rewards (as men speak) of moral and intellectual worth, were open to him at home; to these must be added the closest friendships, the fondest family affections, and an attachment, the strength of which he continually learned, as separation, and a series of after-difficulties, made its realization impossible. Any one of these have, ere now, made a man shrink from a high resolve, and perhaps few men would successfully encounter their combined solicitations. But Mr. Martyn well knew what the Apostle intended when he said, "No man that warreth entangleth himself with the affairs of this life; that he may please him who hath chosen him to be a soldier." Of the last, which was both a sacrifice and a disappointment, he wrote afterwards,—

"O how have I been crossed from childhood, and yet how little benefit have I received from these chastisements of my God. The Lord now sanctify this, that since the last desire of my heart is also withheld, I may with resignation turn away for ever from the world, and henceforth live forgetful of all but God. I shall never have to regret I have loved Thee too well. Thou hast said, 'Delight thyself in the Lord, and he shall give thee the desires of thy heart.'"—*Journals*, ii. 130.

"Endeavouring to keep in mind that I was born to suffer, and striving to be happy under every cross, not by discerning something agreeable in it, but because it is the will of God."—*Ibid.* 158.

He was one that was at no time afraid of evil tidings, for he had been long preparing himself for every such trial.

"I see a great work before me now, (he wrote in 1803,) namely, the subduing and mortifying of my perverted will; what am I that I should dare to do my own will, even if I were not a sinner? But now how plain, how reasonable to have the love of Christ constraining me to be his faithful, willing servant, cheerfully taking up the cross that he shall appoint me."—*Journals*, i. 47.

"It appeared to me monstrous and horrible, that any creature should seek its will in opposition to God's will."—*Ibid.* 69.

The gradual formation of this perfect self-renunciation is remarkably illustrated in the feelings with which he regarded the life of trial to which he had devoted himself. We find him at first beset by the misgivings naturally mingling with all high purposes of self-devotion. Sometimes mistrust of himself—not at all allayed by the officious kindness of friends, who would charitably tell him that he had "neither strength of mind nor of body

for the work," and sometimes by a foresight of the severe trials and hardships he must endure.

"The dejection I sometimes labour under, seems to arise from the prospect of the difficulties I have to encounter in the whole of my future life. The thought that I must be unceasingly employed in the same kind of work amongst poor ignorant people, is what my proud spirit revolts at. To be obliged to submit to a thousand uncomfortable things that must happen to me, whether as a minister or a missionary, is what flesh cannot endure."—*Memoir*, p. 33.

By degrees the single aim of his heart was steadied, and the object of his deliberate choice seemed continually to dilate, and to gather a brightness and an attractiveness which determined his every thought and affection to itself.

"I was under disquiet at the prospect of my future work, encompassed, as it appeared, with difficulties; but I trusted I was under the guidance of Infinite Wisdom, and on that I could rest. Mr. Johnson, who had returned from a mission, observed that the crosses to be endured were far greater than could be conceived; but none of these things move me, neither count I my life dear unto me, so that I might finish my course with joy! Had some disheartening thoughts at night, at the prospect of being stripped of every earthly comfort; but who is it that maketh my comforts to be a source of enjoyment? Cannot the same hand make cold, and hunger, and nakedness, and peril, to be a train of ministering angels conducting me to glory."—*Journals*, i. 32.

When on board ship at the Cape, he writes,—

"I am so far from regretting that I ever came on this delightful work, were I to choose for myself, I could scarcely find a situation more agreeable to my taste."

Out of the many passages in his Indian Journals, carrying out the same testimony, we select only one, written in 1811.

"When I set myself to invent a case of perfect happiness, a case which shall comprehend every thing that ever appeared desirable to me in the days of my vanity or since, I cannot by any means persuade myself that I should be happy: true there appears a change which seems strange to myself. I find it impossible to create, even in imagination, a terrestrial paradise. After trying this thing and that, I see that there is enjoyment rather in giving than receiving. To deny oneself for the good of others, rather than embrace a great number of good things for oneself. It is a greater happiness to obey God than to please self."—*Journals*, ii. 328.

So well had he apprehended the admonition, "*Quantum a te vales exire, tantum in me poteris transire. Sicut nihil foris concupiscere internam pacem facit, sic se interius relinquere Deo conjungit.*" This perfect exinanition of self is the main feature of Mr. Martyn's latter days. In India we find him applying his whole

mind to the translation of Holy Scripture, with an earnestness which showed that he regarded himself but as an instrument for an appointed end, and his life desirable only so long as would suffer him to finish the work that was given him to do. He was engaged at the same moment on two translations of the New Testament into the Hindostanee and Persian languages, in which two-fold undertaking he was aided by an Indian and an Arab. These worthies were a perpetual trial of the passive graces of Mr. Martyn's mind. They were of course unremitting and unrelenting in their mutual recriminations and hostility. The following picture is most graphic:—

“ Mirza happened to hear all Sabat's querulous harangue, and in order to vex, and disgust him effectually, rode almost into his house and came in with his shoes. This irritated the Arab, but Mirza's purpose was not answered. Mirza began next day to tell a parcel of lies about Sabat, and to bring proofs of his own learning. The manifest tendency of all this was to make a division between Sabat and me, and to obtain his salary and work for himself. Oh, the hypocrisy and wickedness of an Indian! I never saw a more remarkable contrast in two men than in Mirza and Sabat. One is all exterior, the other has no outside at all. One a most consummate man of the world, the other an artless child of the Desert.”*

The Hindostanee version of the New Testament was fully approved; but the Persian being thought to contain too many Arabic words and idioms, Mr. Martyn, although his health was then exhibiting the most unequivocal signs of decay, resolved, with his characteristic devotedness, to go into Persia, there to complete the translation. This he was permitted to do.

The following very striking narrative exhibits his moral courage and solitary devotedness. Writing to the late Bishop of Madras, then the Rev. Daniel Corrie, from Shiraz, 1811, he says

“ As there is nothing at all in this dull place to take the attention of the people, no trade, manufactures, or news, every event at all novel is interesting to them. You may conceive therefore what a strong sensation was produced by the stab I aimed at the vitals of Mohammed. Before five people had seen what I wrote, defences of Islam swarmed

* Journals, ii. 166. This unhappy man, Sabat, after professing Christianity for many years, apostatized, and wrote an attack on the Gospels. He again professed repentance, and declared that his attack on revelation was made as a revenge upon one to whom he thought an attack on Christianity would be more painful than a personal injury. He never spoke of Mr. Martyn without the most profound respect, and shed tears of grief whenever he recalled how severely he had tried the patience of this faithful servant of God. He mentioned several anecdotes to show with what extraordinary sweetness of temper Martyn had borne his numerous provocations. “ He was less a man,” he said, “ than an angel from heaven.” This wretched penitent after much inconstancy of conduct became involved in a war at Penang, was taken by the enemy and thrown in a sack into the sea.—*Memoir of the Rev. T. Thomason*, by the Rev. John Sargent, 242—249.

into ephemeral being from all the Moulwee maggots of the place, but the more judicious men were ashamed to let me see them. One Moollah called Aga Acber, determined to distinguish himself. He wrote with great acrimony on the margin of my pamphlet, but passion had blinded his judgment, so that he smote the wind. One day I was on a visit of ceremony to the prime minister, and sitting in great state by his side, fifty visitors in the same hall, and five hundred clients without, when who should make his appearance, but my tetric adversary, the said Aga Acber, who came for the express purpose of presenting the minister with a piece he had composed in defence of the Prophet; and sitting down told me, he should present me with a copy that day. 'There are four answers,' said he, 'to your objection against his using the sword.' 'Very well,' said I, 'I shall be glad to see them, though I made no such objection.' Eager to display his attainments in all branches of science, he proceeded to call in question the truth of our European philosophy, and commanded me to show that the earth moved and not the sun. I told him, 'that in matters of religion, where the salvation of men was concerned, I would give up nothing to them, but as for points in philosophy they might have it all their own way.' This was not what he wanted, so after looking at the minister, to know if it was not a breach of good manners, to dispute at such a time, and finding that there was nothing contrary to custom, but that on the contrary he rather expected an answer, I began, but soon found that he could comprehend nothing without diagrams. A moonshee in waiting was ordered to produce his implements, so there was I drawing figures, while hundreds of men were looking on in silence. But all my trouble was in vain, the Moollah knew nothing whatever of mathematics.*

After a year's residence in Persia, when the object of his life was done, and his health had sunk under intense attacks of fever, and other kinds of suffering, he "set his horse's head towards Constantinople," with the intention of returning to England.

The last days of this devoted servant of God are too deeply affecting to be passed over. After many days travelling on horses, each day closing in with more or less of suffering, Mr. Martyn came soon after sunset on the 2d of October to a small village. There they halted for the night. He endeavoured to find a room where he might be alone.

"Tempted by money they brought me to a stable-room, and Hassan (the Tartar guide) and a number of others planted themselves there with me. My fever here increased to a violent degree; the heat in my eyes and forehead was so great that the fire almost made me frantic. I entreated that it might be put out, or that I might be carried out of doors. Neither was attended to. My servant, who, from my sitting in that strange way on the ground, believed me delirious, was deaf to all I said. At last I pushed my head in among the luggage, and lodged it on the damp ground, and slept.

* Journals, ii. 375, 376.

" Oct. 5. The sleep had refreshed me, but I was feeble and shaken. Yet the merciless Hassan hurried me off. . . . I felt tolerably well till a little after sunset, when the ague came on with a violence I had never before experienced. I felt as if in a palsy, my teeth chattering, and my whole frame violently shaken. . . . The cold fit, after continuing two or three hours, was followed by a fever, which lasted the whole night and prevented sleep.

" Oct. 6. No horses being to be had, I had an unexpected repose. I sat in the orchard, and thought with sweet comfort and peace of my God: in solitude, my company, my friend and comforter. Oh, when shall time give place to eternity! When shall appear that new heaven, and new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness! Where there shall in nowise enter in any thing that defileth: none of that wickedness which has made men worse than wild beasts, none of those corruptions which add still more to the miseries of mortality, shall be seen or heard of any more."

After this came on ten days of unknown sufferings, and on the 16th he entered into the joy of his Lord. In him was indeed realized a large measure of that righteousness which is the incommunicable gift of the perfect. "*Cuncta enim licita respuunt, ad despectum mundi sublimiter accinguntur, licere sibi nolunt omne quod libet, bona sibi amputant etiam concessa, contemnunt visibilia, invisibilibus accenduntur, lamentis gaudent, in cunctis semetipsos humiliant, et sicut nonnulli peccata operum, sic ipsi cogitationum deplorant. Quid itaque istos dixerim, nisi et justos, et poenitentes, qui se et in poenitentia de peccato cogitationis humiliant, et recti semper in opere perseverant?*" *

We must here break off our too cursory remarks on the character of this holy man.

It is no matter of surprise to us that his friend and biographer should have found it necessary to correct, by a personal attestation in the tenth edition of the memoir, an impression left by it, upon the minds of common readers, that Mr. Martyn was of a gloomy temperament. We say we are not surprised, not indeed that we partake of the impression, but because we should have marvelled how the religious world of this day, which, like its brother world, is too brisk and bright to sympathize with the deeper tone and severer cast of primitive faith, should ever read of such a life without some indefinite feeling of recoil. Modern religionists turn away from such a type of severe holiness, as purchasers of modern portraits, from the stern and awful forms of early Christian art. Of all the doctrines of the Cross, that which energetically realizes in us the mystery shadowed upon us in holy baptism, is the least desired. *Via lucis, via crucis*, is the

* S. Greg. M. Hom. in Luc. xv. 1.

unchangeable faith of Catholics, but the illumination of later days reveals the vicarious cross alone. But Mr. Martyn's faith was not so, he lived as one of that goodly fellowship, whose song in the house of their pilgrimage is "*Vita tua, via nostra, per sanctam patientiæ viam ambulamus ad te, qui es corona nostra.*"

One more general remark we must make before we conclude, and that is—how strikingly the vigorous mind of Mr. Martyn felt around for that system, which should have anticipated the necessities of his spiritual warfare, and failing to find it, proceeded, as by an instinct of its own, to throw out a system for its own support. Hence his frequent hours of prayer, his often fastings, and the ascetic discipline which he imposed upon himself. Hence also the ardent thirsting for the communion of saints militant, but most of all the insatiable yearning of his soul for the fellowship of the mystical body gone before him into paradise. "I love to converse, (speaking of their writings,) as it were, with those holy bishops and martyrs, with whom, I hope, through grace, to spend a happy eternity."* "The example of the Christians of the early ages has been a source of sweet reflection to me frequently to-day; the holy love, and devout meditations of Augustine and Ambrose, I delight to think of."† The system of the Church is the mould in which the character of those that are born to its inheritance is formed to the highest cast of Christian perfection, and the standard to which the devout of those that are born without it are continually tending. Archbishop Leighton may be taken as an example of the latter, and Mr. Martyn of the former principle. Our unhappy lot is to find ourselves, though born to the inheritance, in fact defrauded of our portion. The last century and a half has rested like a noisome vapour on the English Church, and now that it seems partially dispersing, it exhibits, as it is drawn up, the fair structures of the Catholic inheritance falling piecemeal, and the vigour of its children palsied. The hereditary treasure of doctrine and discipline has been laid up where the thief entereth and the rust corrupteth. We no longer enter into houses that we have not builded, nor draw out of wells that we have not digged, but each man is doomed to squander the earlier and better part of life, a stranger to his high descent, and then to set about rearing the fabric, and accumulating the treasure he ought to have inherited. But it is not every man that has the subdued but masterly intellect of Mr. Martyn,—it is not every man that is above prejudice, and fearless in the avowal of truth

* *Memoirs*, 126.† *Ibid.* 128.

as he was.* Moreover, the religious teachers of these days are possessed with a principle of thorough eclecticism. They are harmonists of doctrines and ordinances, every man a centre, forming his own system, one adopting as his principle a so-called affinity of doctrines, and another the sensible cravings of man's nature; both proceeding by one and the same rule, and differing only in the accidental mode of its application. It is true that all mysteries converge to their point of emanation in the divine mind; and the system of the Church Catholic is in absolute harmony with the wants of God's redeemed creatures. But neither is the convergency of doctrines, nor the harmony of ordinances, the test of truth *to us*, for the latter may not be felt, nor the former perceptible. *To us* the proof of Catholic truth is an external witness, in kind the same (although in degree continually diminishing) with that which attests the fact and inspiration of Holy Scripture.

Before we close this review, we feel it right to plead guilty to a charge of partiality. Δεῖ γὰρ προεπιπλήττειν. We confess that we have consciously shrunk from noting many forms of opinion and modes of expression; we shall not, therefore, be understood to sanction them. We think that no man can read these Journals without feeling that there is a living bond of fellowship, unaided by sight or sense, bringing all members of the body to a most real, but most mysterious intimacy. "And shall not that recognition be universal? Think ye that ye shall know me then, because ye have known me now; but that my father, or one, it may be, that was long ago a Bishop of this Church, ye shall not know hereafter, because ye have not known him here? Ye shall know them all. They that shall meet *in the resurrection* shall not know each other by looking on the face. There shall be a mutual knowledge with a higher intuition. All shall see, and more perfectly than even Prophets here are wont. They shall see by a vision which is of God, for that all shall be full of God."†

We look then upon these Journals with an awful veneration, as upon the slough of a pure spirit, which has striven, and overcome, and cast its earthly weeds. And will add one only word more, and that of warning to such as may read the record of this saint's warfare with an indolent and listless spirit. We believe

* "Read through in my palanquin," writes Mr. M., "the Missionary Magazine for 1805, and almost felt glad that I was out of the way of such vapid religionism as is too prevalent in England. Though they are the people of God that write, as I do not doubt, yet, alas, how unedifying are most of the pages of a modern magazine, though religious! May I myself be kept from that regard to public opinion, which in such a melancholy degree seems to actuate so many of the ministers, missionary societies, and missionaries of the present day."—*Journals*, ii. 109.

† S. Aug. Sermon in Diebus Pasch. xiv. 5.

that no man can read it with safety, except he that will in some measure put his shoulder to the yoke of a like mortifying discipline. The Church, at this moment, is making loud and urgent demands for men of fervent devotion, unshrinking renunciation of self, and deadness to the world. To such as have heart to follow in that way, Mr. Martyn is in very truth a burning and a shining light.

ART. V.—*Memorials of Oxford.* By James Ingram, D. D., President of Trinity College. 3 Vols. Oxford. Parker.

MOST persons who fall in with this work would but consider it as a collection of beautiful prints, in illustration of one of the most beautiful cities in Europe. In consequence, they will be disposed to place it on their drawing table; a position, which serves to confirm the impression which the first view of it creates. And it really is a most interesting publication, considered merely as a work of art; but those who have been led to cast their eyes on the letter-press, will find a kind of matter there of a very different complexion from the running accompaniment, in large type and small sense, which, in such publications is commonly used to swell the volume without hurting its character.

Dr. Ingram, however, the learned writer of the letter-press, is evidently not a man to figure as a mere chevalier aux dames, or to serve as an elegant appendage to the fashion of the hour. Judging by the work before us, we should say he was as little like a writer in an annual or album as any author we ever read. He is, apparently, one of a race of men, now almost extinct, who used to live all their days both in and for the University. A place like Oxford, it need scarcely be said, alters very much in the outward characteristics of its society, in the course of a very few years; and more so, in a time like this, when alterations and developments of a serious nature are taking place in the structure of society in general. The light which shines so brightly in the metropolis and other great towns, has shot not a few of its piercing rays into the groves and halls of academical repose; newspapers, magazines, and reviews, cannot possibly be made contraband; the fact cannot be kept concealed from their inmates that they are the object of dislike to a considerable portion of the community, and of assault in certain very influential assemblies; and, in consequence, there has been, more or less, a revival of that ancient energetic spirit, that resolve to take part and to have a voice in the world's matters, which is a distinguishing mark of the University in history. Its members have long determined that Church and State shall neither do nor suffer, without their having a share in the

doing or suffering. The circumstances of the times seem to force such a course upon a place, which has never been a mere abode of the muses, but has ever twined the myrtle round the sword; yet at the same time, granting this, so much is clear, that the muses suffer by it, and do not thank the times for its necessity.

They have to mourn over the gradual disappearance of classical taste, antiquarian research, and local knowledge. Oxford was a place of leisurely thought, of multifarious but undigested erudition, of wayward irregular exertion, of enthusiastic college feeling, of repose relieved by the graceful or splendid sallies of wit. It was a place equally favourable for genius and for abuses. No examinations or class-lists directed the mind either of tutor or pupil to definite objects and necessary preparations, or raised their eyes from the walls of their College to the University schools, and from the schools to the busy walks of life. Oxford was their home, their resting-place, and had both the advantages and disadvantages of a home; it was a very dear place, but a very idle one. It was not a place of passage, or of lodging for a year or two, or a means to an end, so frequently as it now is. Such a state of things, had its capabilities been fully understood, might have been productive of most beneficial results; the fault was, not that inducements for exertion were not supplied from without, but that there were no active principles stirring within. One good effect, however, actually followed; very few Fellows of Colleges, we suspect, could now be found, who are well acquainted with the history or antiquities of their own society; how it grew up into its present state, and by whose munificence it has been gradually enriched. On the other hand, talk with an old incumbent visiting the place for a few days, and, if a resident yourself, you will be surprised, if you have not cause to be ashamed, at his accurate knowledge of the localities and peculiarities of a place where your outward man has lived perchance for years, but your mind has been away. While you have been, rightly or wrongly, absorbed in ecclesiastical proceedings or scientific associations, he knows all about the College, from the curious show-books of the library, and the number in full of old silver tankards in the hall, down to the excellence of the pump-water, or the make of the common-room chairs. Such is the difference between the past age and the present;—between this busy anxious day, and a time when Oxford was loved on its own account, and was enjoyed with scarce a thought of what was beyond it.

The learned president of Trinity College, who seems to have had a most efficient co-adjutor in Mr. Parker, the publisher, has

shown in the work before us, to what good account a well-stored mind may turn devotion towards a place which is beautiful as youth and venerable as age; and since his antiquarian lore is very uncommon at present, and may have escaped attention under the fascination of Messrs. Mackenzie and Le Keux's share in the work, we think it may be interesting here to put together some leading facts relative to the early history of the University, which he has scattered through it, before or apart from the existence of colleges. We call them facts, in an antiquarian sense, not as ignorant that much may be said for and against every assignable point of past history, but in order to intimate that it is our intention, not to dispute or investigate, but to surrender ourselves to the pleasing imagination that there is such a thing as certainty attainable by the human mind, as regards matters which the eye has not seen.

Little can be narrated in any connected way concerning the University previous to the Norman conquest. The ravages of the Danes, civil troubles, and the debased state of religion, interrupted and dissipated, at least the records, if not the schools and studies themselves of the peaceful place; and the scanty glimpses which are left to us are like the broken remembrances with which we retrace that first mysterious portion of our childhood, ere memory has yet become continuous, or we come to live in the thought of our own identity. However, amid the dim notices of almost fabulous ages, on which the institutions existing in later times force us back, we are led to dwell upon one passage of Saxon history, both from its interest and the satisfactory evidence on which its main outline rests,—the history of St. Frideswide. It seems, that about the year 727 a certain governor, provost, or viceroy, “subregulus,” as he is called, of the name of Didan, ruled over a large portion of the city of Oxford, with dignity and honour. His wife's name was Saffrida; and their daughter was called Frideswide. Having received a religious education from a female of eminent sanctity, this young lady not only embraced the monastic life herself, but induced twelve other of her equals, of respectable families, to do the like. Her mother dying about this time, Didan seeking consolation, according to the fashion of those times, in some work of piety, employed himself in the construction of a conventual Church within the precincts of the city; and having dedicated it in honour of St. Mary and All Saints, he committed it to the superintendence of his daughter. This Church, which was known by the name of “St. Mary of Oxford prope Tamesin,” or “on the Thames,” was the rudiment of the present Cathedral, as the priory attached to it was of Christ Church.

Frideswide's Priory was, even from the first, something beyond a simple religious foundation. She died October 19th, 740, and was buried in her own church : but even before her death, or shortly after, the king of Mercia, in whose territory Oxford lay, (Ethelbald,) constructed certain inns for the advancement of learning, in connexion with the sacred edifice. Alfred, 150 years later, after wresting the city from the Danes, restored them. Nothing is known of her foundation for another hundred years, that is, till A. D. 1000, by which date the priory of St. Frideswide had been richly endowed, its territories increased, and its church enlarged. Oxford was, at that time, the metropolis of Mercia, and had been a favourite seat both of Saxon and Danish monarchs. King Ethelred (1004) built the tower, which, with an additional Norman story and spire, is still standing. So great was the king's satisfaction at his own improvements, that he calls it, in the half-modernized orthography of an extant MS., "myn owne Mynster in Oxensford." Another hundred years brought a fresh series of changes; the nuns were gone, never to return; secular canons had succeeded, had fallen into disorder, and in turn been dispossessed; and in their place an austere Norman, chaplain to Henry I., was made the prior of an establishment of regulars. Under this form the foundation remained till the time of Wolsey, when those further changes were made which brought it into its present shape. Meanwhile, the prior and canons of St. Frideswide were some of the most learned and scientific persons of their times, and their patroness was proportionably honoured. Her relics, it seems to be clearly ascertained, were, in 1180, translated, in Wood's words, "from an obscure to a more noted place in the Church," being deposited in a reliquary, which Dr. Ingram supposes to remain to this day; miracles are said to have followed; rich offerings were made at her shrine, and ample endowments added to her foundation. A more splendid shrine was dedicated for the purpose of receiving her remains in 1289, and one still more splendid, about 1480. Sermons were preached at her cross, the university authorities went in annual procession to her altar, and as late as 1434, she is called in a public instrument, "the special advocate of the flourishing University of Oxford."

Such is the history of the earliest endowment for learning, in a place which was destined to be so fruitful in noble institutions. The next that is to be noticed, brings us back to the important era which, while it forms a sort of commencement of our civil history, brought the University also into a new stage of its existence. Only ten years had passed after the troubles attending

the Conquest, in which Oxford largely partook, when we find signs of returning life in a spot which has since that time so often needed, and so often shown a similar pertinacity of life. The Castle Tower, which still is seen on the left, by travellers leaving for Bath or Cheltenham, belonged to the Collegiate Church of St. George, and was founded at that date by Robert D'Oiley for secular canons of the order of St. Augustine, being such (observes Wood) as were "most fit for a University, and not bound to keep their cloister, as regulars are." Here they continued till their translation to Oseney Abbey, in 1149, "at which time," says the same writer, "this their said habitation became a nursery for secular students, subject to the Chancellor's jurisdiction." Brumman le Riche endowed this same Church of St. George, at its first foundation, with land in the northern suburbs of Oxford; whence, as Dr. Ingram supposes, rose the tradition that the University was anciently on that side the town. Thus established as a learned institution, it continued, in the patronage of Oseney Abbey, till the dissolution of the latter; being governed by statutes similar in some respects to those of more recent colleges, and consisting of a warden, fellows, and scholars. The warden was always to be chosen from the canons of Oseney; the fellows and scholars were sworn to the performance of Divine service, and to obedience to the warden, and to a life of charity and purity. There were five secular priests, and the scholars were in number twelve, for the most part Welsh. Such was another of the earliest literary foundations of the place; being situated on a spot originally a palace, and now a gaol.

Since Oseney Abbey has been mentioned, it may be allowed us in a few words to take notice of this celebrated establishment, though it lies somewhat beyond the line of our subject. It was founded, as has been said, in the early part of the 12th century, as a priory of Augustinian monks; and so many benefactions poured in, that it soon became an abbey, and ultimately one of the largest and most magnificent in the kingdom. From the great extent and splendour of its buildings, Wood says, "it was one of the first ornaments and wonders of this place and nation." It was situated in an island formed by different branches of the Ouse, Isis, or Thames, whence it derived its name of Oseney. The church dedicated, as St. Frideswide's, to St. Mary the Virgin, was lofty, and was adorned with two towers; its bells were celebrated as the best in England in those times, and are the same as were known in Dean Aldrich's, and down to our own time, as "the merry Christ Church bells." The famous Tom of Oxford, which rings nightly at nine o'clock, was the bell in the clock-tower. The edifice was enriched with a variety of chapels, hav-

ing not less than twenty-four distinct altars. The abbot's house was also celebrated for its splendour, and was frequently honoured by the company of kings, prelates, and nobles of the first rank ; having an hall, as a writer describes it, " more befitting a common society than a private man." The cloisters, the kitchen, the great hall, and the infirmary, were at a corresponding scale of magnificence. King Henry III. after he had raised the siege before Kenilworth, passed his Christmas here ; celebrating the season for seven days' space, " with great revelling and mirth." Of all these gorgeous buildings scarcely a vestige now remains, and had not a knowledge of the site been preserved, by tradition and the diligence of antiquarians, it could not have been conjectured. Some unevenness in a broad and fertile meadow marks the site of the great quadrangle ; and a wall, gate, and window belonging to its outbuildings are still standing, near a mill which inherits its name.

The seminaries for learning which we have already spoken of, were situated on the banks of the Thames : but now receding from it, we must proceed up the rising ground to the north of the city, to the place now occupied by Worcester College, where lay the land with which Le Riche endowed the church of St. George. Here was the great Benedictine college, founded by John Giffard, baron of Brimesfield, in 1283, for the reception of the novices sent from Benedictine Abbey at Gloucester. In the original documents relating to this place, the site is much extolled on account of its suitableness for study ; a consideration which seems to have induced Giffard to enlarge this establishment, as a " generale studium" for all the Benedictine novices in the province of Canterbury ; three-fourths of the novices of that community being, it is said, at this era sent to Oxford, and the remainder to Cambridge. The Benedictine monks were then, what they have shown themselves in these later times, a learned body, as their founder designed ; and a tax being imposed at a general chapter of the order on the greater abbeys of their fraternity, buildings for the respective students of each community quickly rose. These were distinct from each other, and distinguished by appropriate escutcheons and rebusses over the doors, some of which remain to this day. The students were governed by a superior called " Prior Studentium," chosen by themselves, similarly to the rule, still nominally observed, as regards the election of principals of halls. About the year 1348 we find two chairs of theology established for their instruction, one here, and one at Durham College.

This Durham College was a sister establishment to the last mentioned, being designed as a nursery for the Benedictine

priory of Durham, as the former establishment had originated in the wants of the Benedictines of Gloucester. It was founded about 1286, under a grant of land "to God and our Lady, and to St. Cuthbert, and to the prior and convent of Durham," not far from the Benedictines of Gloucester College, and occupying nearly the same site where Trinity College now stands. Several bishops of the see of Durham became their benefactors, among whom Richard Angervyle, or de Bury, in the beginning of the fourteenth century, left them his great collection of books, which was to be open for the use of all students. The library built for this collection by his immediate successor still remains, as does the liberality with which it is opened to novices, though no longer of the Benedictine order. At the end of the same century the foundation consisted of eight fellows, who were to be priests or monks, one being warden or prior, and eight secular scholars; at the time of the great religious revolution of the sixteenth century, with other religious houses, it was suppressed, and its revenues transferred to the new dean and chapter of Durham.

The institutions and schools connected with them, which we have hitherto described, were of a monastic character, richly endowed, and situated in the suburbs of the town, as became places of retirement and of dignity. But meanwhile within the city, and without the advantages resulting from the power and wealth of Augustinians or Benedictines, was growing up a distinct family, as it may be called, of schools, called secular, as the former were called claustral, which became the materials for the most part out of which the collegiate system was afterwards formed. There is a spot in the centre of the city, where Alfred is said to have lived, and which may be called the native place or river-head of three separate societies, still existing—University, Oriel, and Brasenose. Brasenose claims his palace, Oriel his church, and University his school or academy.

Of these Brasenose College is still called in its formal style "the King's Hall," which is the name by which Alfred himself in his laws calls his palace; and it has its present singular name from a corruption of *brasinium*, or *brasin-huse*, as having been originally located in that part of the royal mansion, which was devoted to the then important accommodation of a brew-house.

The history of the adjacent church, which has belonged to Oriel College for above 500 years, introduces to our notice a sort of repetition of the history of St. Frideswide. A nunnery, as we have seen, formed the first rudiments of the University, and of a church of St. Mary's on the banks of the Thames; and a nunnery some little way off it was closely associated with the

later secular schools, out of which the present colleges have arisen, and with the second St. Mary's Church in the heart of the city. The liberty of Littlemore lies on an elevated plain, between two and three miles to the south of Oxford towards London. It was in former times covered with woods, and is bounded by a brook which joins the Thames. Situated upon this brook, even in the Saxon days, was a convent, which was rebuilt soon after the Conquest, and the ruins of which still remain bearing its original Saxon name of Mynchery. It belonged to nuns of the Benedictine order, whose devotion to the advancement of learning showed itself worthy of the ancient rule which they professed. What was its first connection with Oxford does not clearly appear from the work before us, but so much we know, that the church which Alfred is said to have built on the site of the present University Church, is incidentally spoken of as St. Mary's, even as early as the Domesday survey, and is also known to be dedicated to "our Lady of Littlemore." This church Alfred seems, according to the general current of history and tradition, to have made the nucleus of his assembled scholæ or places of education, of which a religious idea and sanction must ever be the binding principle. From the west end of the church, passing along his palace, "the King's Hall of Brasin-huse," as already described, ran in later times a long street, called School Street, up to the north wall of the city, and this was thickly tenanted and peopled by schools, both claustral and especially secular. These schools were originally attached to the halls there situated, being commonly the largest rooms in it, though others were dependencies of the monastic bodies in the neighbourhood, and were but rooms over the tradesmen's shops. Among the latter the convent of Littlemore is especially to be noticed. Besides being possessed of the ancient hall, now called St. Alban's, and then Nun Hall, to the south of the church, it possessed schools in the street just mentioned, which were called after the name of St. Mary of Littlemore. Nor was this all;—the church of St. Mary itself, as well as its vicinage, was in process of time sought as a kind of refuge and domicile of the learning of the day. In School Street there were, in the beginning of the fifteenth century, as many as thirty-two schools; but before that time the inconvenience of the rooms in the halls used for their meetings had been felt; and in Lent the number of bachelors was sometimes greater than they could contain. In such cases they performed their exercises in or over the larger shops of the citizens; but at length they were led to address themselves to Mary's Church itself. By permission of the crown, to whom the church at that time belonged, a variety of subordinate chapels or chan-

tries were erected about it, and endowed by individuals or fraternities with annual stipends to the officiating priests. Many of these have been entirely obliterated by subsequent alterations and repairs of the edifice, or have assumed different names; though some remained under their former distinctive titles, even after the present church was built, as the University books show. When what is called "a public act" was held, no less than six separate portions of the church and its appendages were assigned to the different faculties and degrees. Of these chapels there still remains the chancel of the old church, said to have been built by Henry I., and our Lady's Chapel, which now bears the name of Adam de Brom, from the altar-tomb there standing of the original founder of St. Mary's College, or as it is now called Oriel, who, being rector of the church, gained it for his new foundation, and was there buried.

While the schools of the early university thus gathered under the shade, nay (if we may be allowed the figure) even in the branches of St. Mary's,—or rather literally, like "the swallow" in the Psalms, lodged in still more sacred parts of it,—the same venerable building also became the seat of a public library. This was begun in the first years of the fourteenth century, over the chapel of Henry I. about the time when the Church passed into the possession of the new foundation of Oriel; but in consequence of disputes which followed between that society and the University, it was not brought into use for nearly a hundred years. The chamber still remains and is the present Law School, which, still forming part of a sacred building, is a curious remains of a state of things long past away. As to the present church, with which we are here comparatively little concerned, it may suffice to say that it lies for the most part on the south of the ancient building, that the tower was built, or at least completed, under the superintendence of Adam de Brom in the beginning of the fourteenth century, the chancel by a Provost of Oriel in the middle of the fifteenth, and the nave and aisle by the University in the end of the same century.

While these additions and improvements were making in the church the schools were gradually withdrawn from its sacred precincts, and re-assembled upon their present site. Of the existing buildings the beautiful Divinity School was not finished till towards the end of the fifteenth century; and the quadrangle in James I.'s reign. A remarkable instance of the vicissitudes of the place occurred in the interval. The usual exercises and scholastic acts in the University being suspended during the religious troubles in Edward VI.'s time, the whole area between the divinity school and the buildings which stood on the

site of the present quadrangle was converted into a garden and a pig-market; and the schools themselves being abandoned by the masters and scholars, were used by glovers and laundresses. In Wood's quaint language, "there where Minerva sat as regent for several ages, was nothing remaining all the reign of King Edward VI. but wretched solitariness, and nothing but a dead silence appeared."

We have now seen Alfred's palace develope itself, if we may so speak, into St. Mary's Church and the Schools, as representatives of the two great elements of education, religion and learning; but to complete the account, notice should be taken of the much debated point whether that celebrated king gave to any of his schools a principle of continuity, or in more intelligible language, whether he founded or established any particular body. This, as is well known, is maintained in the affirmative by University College, which asserts that it is the identical school, hall, or inn which Alfred instituted; and Dr. Ingram considers that this claim does not rest on such vague authority as is commonly supposed. It is recognized in an order of parliament as early as 1384, and in licenses of mortmain and other grants from the crown in the respective reigns of Henry IV. and VI., Elizabeth, and James I.; moreover it was indirectly but distinctly confirmed in a judgment of the court of King's Bench in 1726. As far however as the question is an historical one, we only know the following fact;—that the bequest of the founder of the College in the thirteenth century was employed in buying the Brasenose or Brasin-huse, with its schools, which has already been described as Alfred's palace; near which the members of the College resided for about eighty years, when they seem to have removed to their present site.

To the general inquirer it is more interesting to recognize in these early events connected with University College the first dawn of that collegiate system, which is the form into which at present the University is almost or altogether cast. Colleges seem to have arisen in consequence of the inconveniences necessarily attendant upon the irregular state of University education when carried beyond its original religious limits. When literature, no longer confined within the precincts and discipline of a monastery, wandered forth in the halls and chambers of School Street, and dispersed itself among a hundred independent parties, what was to be expected as its fortune but confusion and vicissitude? At the first part of the thirteenth century the disorders consequent upon such free trade in letters reached their height;—and what aggravated their seriousness was the almost incredible number of students whom the reputation of the place attracted thither. In the last years of Henry III. they are said to have

amounted to thirty thousand; while in the beginning of the same monarch's reign there had been no more than three thousand. Just before he came to the throne all three thousand on one occasion seceded from the University, as Matthew Paris tells us, leaving not one behind. Serious tumults and quarrels between hostile parties were also frequent, of which loss of life was no uncommon attendant. Moreover the buildings themselves in which the students were lodged were of a wretched and unsafe description. Fires were frequent; in consequence of which the inhabitants began to build with stone and slate, instead of timber and thatch; and, when they could not afford the expense, they commonly erected a high stone wall between rows of four, or six, or more houses, remains of which are still to be seen. But the institutions which came in with the middle of the thirteenth century brought a remedy for both the physical and moral inconveniences which have been mentioned; to Walter de Merton, the founder of Merton College, (A. D. 1264,) is commonly attributed the introduction of the Collegiate system itself; and William of Wykeham, the founder of New, a century later, was the first to establish it in buildings of suitable splendour and permanence, most of which are actually remaining still.

The history of the Colleges, however, has been too often discussed, and is too generally known, to call for any lengthened consideration here. We have preferred to confine ourselves to the first shape in which an academical system showed itself, when as yet it was cherished in the bosom of sacred institutions, which, as not existing in this day, are almost forgotten. The monastic bodies of the middle ages have not even left their names to the flourishing establishments which are erected on their site, and, more or less, endowed with their property. Yet that they should have risen again, in any shape, in these latter days, is remarkable enough, and most encouraging to those whom the turbulence and dangers of the present hour might else induce to despond. St. Frideswide's Priory, St. George's Chapel, the Abbey of Oseney, the Benedictine establishments for Gloucester and Durham have disappeared; but Christ Church is a magnificent monument to the memory of the abbots and canons regular who preceded it: Trinity occupies the site of Durham, and Worcester the buildings of Gloucester College; St. John's is a revival of a Cistercian establishment founded on the same spot in the fifteenth century; and Wadham has risen amid the ruins of an Augustinian foundation of the thirteenth, whose disputative powers were held in honour in the exercises of the University Schools down to 1800.*

* The practice of holding disputations "apud Augustinenses," colloquially called "doing Austins," continued without interruption down to the introduction of the new

Such is the vitality, such the reproductive power, which this celebrated University has been vouchsafed. If persons like ourselves might presume to offer its members any counsel, it would be never to forget that their present life is but a continuation of the life of past ages, that they are, after all, only in a new form and with new names, the Benedictines and Augustinians of a former day. The monastic element, a most important ingredient in the social character of the Church, lingers among them, when the nation at large has absorbed it in the frivolous or evil tempers and opinions of an advanced period of civilization. To the Universities is committed the duty of cherishing and exemplifying Christian simplicity, nobleness, self-devotion, munificence, strictness, and zeal, which have well nigh vanished elsewhere. To them only it falls, especially if chapters are to be swept away, to show that the Christian can be deeply read in the philosophy of ancient truth, and serenely prescient of the future from his comprehension of the past. To them only it falls, as being out of the world, to measure and expose it, and, as being in the heart of the Church, to strengthen her to resist it. It is their *place* to be old-fashioned; let them but have the moral and intellectual strength not to forget or be ashamed of it, but to carry out the doctrines, which are their portion, boldly, without haggling at the cost they must incur to be consistent with themselves. We say this the rather, because we have observed, with some concern, a disposition in certain quarters to shrink from that position which alone has saved them heretofore, or can save them in time to come. Institutions come to nothing when they abandon the principle which they embody; Oxford has ever failed in self-respect, and has injured its inward health and stability, as often as it has forgotten that it was a creation of the middle ages, and has affected new fashions, or yielded to external pressure. It conceded nothing in the Rebellion, but waited to be robbed, and it gained all back in the course of a few years; it submitted, by its own act, to William of Orange, and years of disgrace followed. A few years since a passing humour seized it to open its gates to the Association for Science; Dissenters of all hues were allowed to gaze upon its buildings; "its precious things, the silver and the gold, and the spices and the precious ointment," "there was nothing among its treasures that it showed them not." Four of the most eminent among them, each of a separate

examination statute. They were held in the School of Natural Philosophy every Saturday in full term; and every B. A. after his Lent determination, was bound to dispute there once every year, either as opponent or respondent, before he could proceed to his Master's degree.

persuasion, were honoured with degrees; and it was condescendingly predicted by not the least eminent of his body (an Unitarian, we believe), that by such a policy Oxford had added a hundred years to its existence. Scarcely had a twelvemonth passed, when the proper fruits of it appeared; those who had been admitted to covet, felt a greater pang at its gates being closed against them, than pleasure in the memory of the short week when they had been opened; and the visit of the savans to Oxford was the precursor of the bill introduced into the Commons for the permanent admission of Dissenters to its lecture-rooms. Such is the inevitable consequence of aping or trembling at the external world.

And while Oxford ever shows so well as when resisting innovation, and rallying round some ancient principle which is imperilled, it never shows so weakly as when, professing such a course, it yet censures or separates from those who centuries ago did the same. Yet this is an inconsistency to which its members, in common with our whole Church, have been much tempted ever since the Reformation, when political changes and the general growth of liberal notions, have rendered the principles cherished in the University unpopular in the nation. Men cannot bear to be associated in the minds of others with those whom others condemn; and, instead of denying they are really contemptible, they deny that they themselves resemble them. Hence the common practice, of which the University, indeed, affords far fewer specimens than other places, though it is, unhappily, not altogether without them now and then, of men's purchasing for themselves a license for what the world calls intolerance and bigotry, by declaiming against the like alleged failings in their forefathers, or of hiding, as far as may be, their own modicum of so-called formality and superstition, by denouncing those who had a little more of both than themselves. Hence, too, they try to escape the odium of resisting present reforms, by inveighing against the corruptions of the ante-reformation era,—and the imputation of Popery, which with the multitude is a frightful word for every thing that is bad and hateful, by ungenerously charging it on past ages which cannot defend themselves. How much better and honester is it, when asked whether those who resist present innovations would not have also resisted certain parts of the great Reformation, to answer that it is one's duty to stand by whatever is established, till it is proved to be positively wrong, and therefore to maintain many a custom and rule now, which before it was established it would have been equally a duty to resist. Who considers it an inconsistency in Sir R. Peel now to stand by the Reform Act, of which before it had passed he was a strenuous opponent? Who would

consider it wise in him, if he continued to oppose what is done and over? Yet who would not consider it an absurdity if he thought the only way to maintain it was to enlarge on its intrinsic merits? This way of viewing the position of the University is intelligible; but it really is losing time and toil to deny, what is as plain as day, that Oxford has, and ever has had, what men of the world will call a popish character, that in opinion and tone of thought, its members are successors of the monks, or that as they oppose the Rowland Hills and Pye Smiths of this day, they would have also opposed the Foxes and Knoxes of the Reformation. Surely it is their wisdom, as they follow, so to avow they follow ancient times; as it is their happiness to know they follow them. Let them not fear to connect themselves with their predecessors; let them discern in their beautiful homes, the awful haunts of past ages, and past ages will stand by them. Let them track out the vestiges of the old city, and with the hero in the poet's romance, they will find a talisman amid the ruins; "the talisman is faith!" or in the words of another poet, who speaks with the affection of a son of Oxford,—

"But thou, my mother! green as erst and pure
 Thy willows wave, thy meeting waters glide;
 Untarnished on thy matron breast endure
 The treasured gems, thy youth's delight and pride,
 Firm loyalty, serene and fond,
 Wearing untired her lofty bond;
 Awful reverence bending low,
 Where'er the heavens their radiance throw;
 And wisdom's mate, simplicity,
 That in the gloom dares trust the guiding arm on high;
 These, of old, thy guardians tried,
 Daily kneeling at thy side,
 And wont by night to fan thy vigil fires,
 We feel them hovering now around the aerial spires."

ART. VI.—*The Life of John Jay, First Chief Justice of the United States, and Governor of New York.* By his son, William Jay. 2 vols. 8vo. New York. 1833.

THE authors of great events have seldom taken the pains to record them. The Duke of Wellington would never read Col. Napier's history of the war in Spain, lest he should be "led into a literary controversy more troublesome" * than a winter campaign in La Mancha. What a rarity would be Queen Elizabeth's

* Perceval's Remarks on Colonel Napier, p. 59.

diary at Tilbury Fort, or the rough notes of Themistocles before the battle of Salamis! His unequalled versatility of talent, and the consciousness that he was acting in the world's foremost theatre, have made Cæsar an exception; yet his incomparable work was designed probably but as a preparatory sketch for some maturer composition. "Ceteri," wrote Hirtius, when this purpose had been frustrated by the dagger of Brutus, "quam bene atque emendate, nos etiam quam facile atque celeriter eos perfecterit, scimus."

In this, as in every other respect, we seem destined to reverse the maxims of our fathers. Talleyrand, imitating the less distinguished miscreants, Vidocq and Barrington, has left a written detail of his intrigues. Chateaubriand has recorded the impression which the same half century has made on a man of honour and a Christian. The increase of correspondence has enabled us to study the character of some of our own distinguished men in their undress, at home, and among their associates. The contrast between persons seen in this manner, "au naturel," and the constrained attitudes put on for exhibition, is self-evident. Yet as the world moves on, society seems to defile and soil the verdure to which it is admitted: men write letters to their wives and children as if the public looked over their shoulders; and diaries become pamphlets, dedicated to their executors. For ourselves, we protest against reading any private journal, which we do not know to have been destined to the fire; for it is not a great book with a lock and key to it, which can ensure the inimitable simplicity of Sir Walter Scott's diary . . . the soliloquy of the great novelist is perfect, till on a sudden he turns round to predict our remarks, when we read the confessions of the well-seeming baronet of Abbotsford.

This fashion of writing private papers for the public, the authors of the American Revolution have carried to a fearful extent. Marshall's *Life of Washington*, "*insanæ molis*," is entitled to a painful pre-eminence. Dr. Franklin's philosophical fame is attested by three quarto volumes of correspondence. Thomas Jefferson invented a copying machine, that not a word of his chit-chat to his friends might be lost to posterity. The public may be as thankful for the weakness of wrist which sometimes clogged his pen, as a schoolboy when he hears that above 100 books of Livy are wanting. These collections are not without interest. Taken as the testimony of friends to the importance of their writers, they are natural; and the insight which they afford into the springs of action, are at times valuable. But that such documents should be preserved by their writers—that Jefferson, the stern republican, without heart or affection, should write frivolous

ties to women with a polygraph pen, or send them letters marked by the copying press,—is, except in the case of Doddridge, without example on this side of the Atlantic.

The phenomenon may probably be referred to the change which took place in men's habits when attornies were called to legislate, and book-keepers made treaties. The remark applies in a measure to the valuable work before us; but its subject was too sensible a man to enter in his "letter book" what he was not willing should be heard in Broadway, and that he might not come naked before the world, he seems to have sat in full dress at home. His letters are certainly very wanting in vivacity; but we have not the less respect for the man because we find he disliked to gossip about secrets of state, and that his own services were the last topic on which he loved to dwell. Those services, however, appear to have been valued by the better part of his countrymen; and if Washington be the great captain of the United States—Franklin, their philosopher—and Jefferson, their successful politician—the praise of being an most honest and disinterested labourer for the public good belongs to no man more pre-eminently than to the first chief justice of the Union, John Jay.

His family, though not sordid, was without distinction. It was of French extraction: his grandfather had fled after the revocation of the edict of Nantz; and so little did the emigrants forget the tie of kindred, that his boyhood was spent in a village and at a school where French was still vernacular. Thus did the future diplomatist acquire an accomplishment which could scarcely have been expected from the son of a retired New York merchant. At fourteen he was sent to Columbia (then King's) college, at New York; and before he left it, must have convinced the "High Tory" divine who presided there what combustible ingredients lay buried in the then tranquil soil of the colonies.

"A number of students being assembled in the college hall, some of them, either through a silly spirit of mischief, or in revenge for some fault imputed to the steward, began to break the table. The president, attracted by the noise, entered the room, but not so speedily as to find the offenders in the act. He immediately arranged the students in a line, and beginning at one end, asked, 'Did you break the table?' The answer was, 'No.' 'Do you know who did?' Passing along the line, the same questions and answers were asked and received, till he came to Mr. Jay, who was the last but one in the line. To the first question he replied as the others had done, and to the second he answered, 'Yes, sir.' 'Who was it?' 'I do not choose to tell you, sir,' was the unexpected reply. The young gentleman below him returned the same answers. The president expostulated and threatened, but in vain. The contumacious students were called before a board of the professors, where

Mr. Jay made their defence The defence was overruled, and the delinquents were sentenced to be suspended and rusticated. Mr. Jay returned to college at the expiration of his sentence ; and Dr. Cooper, by the kindness of his reception, suffered him to perceive that he had not, by his conduct, forfeited any part of his good opinion."—vol. i. p. 15.

Our young Brutus had soon an opportunity of signaling himself in a wider sphere. In the year 1774, six years after he had been called to the bar, was passed the Boston Port Bill. This was the consummation of those measures by which the British Parliament proposed to tax its colonies. The attempt had been openly made nine years earlier by the Stamp Act, and its abandonment encouraged the Americans to oppose the commercial regulations by which the same end was attained more covertly. The other colonies had thought it sufficient to abstain from taxed commodities ; but the boldness of the people of Boston, in destroying a vessel of tea, the property of the East India Company, provoked the parent state to interdict their trade, and suspend the provincial charter of Massachusetts. The announcement of this measure was the signal for a rising from Maine to Georgia. A meeting of the disaffected was held at New York : a committee was organized ; and from the pen, apparently, of Jay, one of its members, proceeded nearly the earliest proposal for a general congress. The result is well known. A congress met at Philadelphia in September, 1774. Jay represented his native city, New York. " He was in the twenty-ninth year of his age, and, it is believed, the youngest member of the house."—(vol. i. p. 30.) But he seems to have been more disposed to moderation than his elders. Though no man was more likely to rise to notoriety by turbulent attempts—though he was the author of the address of Congress to the people of Great Britain, a composition which " Jefferson, while still ignorant of the author, declared to be a production of the finest pen in America,"—yet the measure which he had most at heart was one which, if it did not prevent, might, as he hoped, excuse rebellion. " On the 8th of July," 1775, " Congress individually signed a petition to the King. This measure originated with Mr. Jay, and was carried by him against a very strong opposition in Congress." He " maintained that if the people were called to take up arms against their sovereign, they ought to be persuaded that such a measure was unavoidable, and that the conviction that no proper efforts to prevent such an event had been omitted, would reconcile the consciences of many to a course of conduct which would *otherwise* be inconsistent with their oaths of allegiance. The petition was lawful and respectful."—(vol. i. p. 36.) How Mr. Jay would have defended the " otherwise," which was such a

peacemaker to his conscience, we pretend not to understand; but his scruples contrast well with the recklessness of many of his colleagues. Jefferson thus describes the petition:—"The disgust against its humility was general; and Mr. Dickinson's delight at its passage—the petition had been of his drawing—was the only circumstance which reconciled them to it. The vote being passed, he could not refrain from rising and expressing his satisfaction, and concluded by saying, 'there is but one word, Mr. President, in the paper which I disapprove, and that is the word *congress*.' On which Ben Harrison rose and said, 'There is but one word, Mr. President, of which I approve, and that is the word *congress*.'"

Little favour as Mr. Jay's scruples found with the violent partisans around him, they will recommend him to the esteem of good men in less turbulent times. Whether he was right in thinking rebellion necessary to the safety of himself and his fellow-countrymen—whether God's Providence could not have found a course for preventing oppression, without even a seeming violation of oaths—whether the most successful revolution is not germinant with its own punishment, while it is given to faith and patience to choose the good and refuse the evil; these are questions too large to be at present opened. One admission however we may freely make—that of all popular movements none admits of greater excuse than the American insurrection. There was but a single person in Great Britain who had any right to censure it; that person the one, whose conduct by a strange obliquity has been the subject of greatest complaint, the king. Nation against nation, and assembly against assembly—we think there was no just ground for the feeling in this country against America; a feeling which made the war as popular in its outset, as it was loathed in its consequences. A few words will explain our meaning.

The rights of Englishmen depend on a set of laws, written or verbal, some of them drawn from general principles of justice, and some from accidental peculiarities of our various forefathers. The basis of the constitution thus derived is not any express code which the nation has ratified, much less those principles of abstract right in which philosophers seldom agree, and which demagogues never respect, but—the only thing on which any durable liberty has been ever built—the principle of *prescription*. The British Constitution, like all other valuable social institutions, has grown gradually out of the arrangements of Providence, and was not developed by the hand of man. At this day our national security and happiness—the liberty which, as Englishmen, we yet retain—our freedom from the various discomforts which beset the republics of the new world, or the monarchies of the old—are

attributable not to those bungling alterations which the social fabric underwent during the hurricane of 1833, but to the old institutions which outlived it. We are satisfied, not because of Lord John Russell's bill, but notwithstanding it. Even the American Constitution, strange to say, owes its present stability, not to the wisdom of its designers, but to that basis of ancient principle and practice on which it was reared. Transplanted to Mexico it has failed altogether.

The British legislature therefore is not designed to create new rights, but to enforce old ones. It is an authorized expositor of what is already the Constitution. This is shown by the very terms of the complaint so often heard, that proposed measures are unconstitutional. The expression implies some fixed basis which ought to be respected. In theory then the business of parliament is to apply old principles to new emergencies, not by virtue of any authority delegated to it by the people, but as being itself part of the prescriptive system which it maintains. To this the sounder part of the American colonists made no opposition. They allowed the Imperial Parliament to be the authoritative expositor of the ancient laws. Their quarrel lay properly with the people, not with the king—not with his Majesty and the three estates, but with the House of Commons.

Among the most beneficial of our political principles is that which guarantees private property, and ordains that whatever is needed for public purposes should be obtained, not by force, but by the voluntary concession of its owners. If any abstract principle were the basis of British rights it would unquestionably be Mr. Jay's favourite maxim that "those who own the country ought to govern it."—vol. i. p. 70. *Representation of property*, though it has no natural connection with the legislative power, is connected by usage with that of granting contributions. This it was on which the bulk of Americans insisted. They maintained that according to the theory of the British Constitution they ought to be taxed by their own assemblies. In this Lord Chatham supported them. "Parliament," he said, in 1766, "has no right to lay a tax upon the colonies. At the same time I assert the authority of this kingdom to be sovereign and supreme in any circumstance of government and legislature whatever. Taxation is no part of the governing or legislative power." The House of Commons and British nation judged differently; with them therefore the contest was waged, and it was their power which would have been increased by success.

The rights here assigned to the British legislature contrast curiously with those of a body to which in a measure it served as a model, the American Congress. The functions of these two

legislative bodies have this difference, that Parliament *ought* not to change fundamental laws, and Congress *cannot*. The constitution however is often treated by Parliament as Holy Scripture by the Church of Rome ; it is compelled to bear that meaning which is put upon it by the last enactments of the infallible body. In vain do the judges declare what was heretofore the authorized and constitutional notion ; their decision goes for no more than the consent of antiquity with the papacy, the dictum of the living expositor is infallible. Parliament, says Lord Coke, can do any thing but make a man a woman or a woman a man. Not so the American Congress. It puts its meaning indeed upon the authorized constitution, but its decision may be reversed by a higher authority. The judges may declare its enactments to be inconsistent with the fundamental laws. It appeals to them, exactly as the Church of England does to the ancient Fathers, as an authority which it is not to guide but to follow. The judges therefore are evidently the great conservative point of the American Constitution ; and much moment was attached to Washington's selection of a chief justice when he entered upon the office of President in 1788. His choice fell upon Jay.

Already had Mr. Jay displayed the integrity and decision which fitted him for such a post. After filling various offices at home, among them that of chief justice of the State of New York, he had been sent as ambassador from the United States to Spain. His familiarity with the French language may have pointed him out for this service, as we find that he had been employed in the very first intercourse between the colonies and a foreign power. This had occurred in the year 1775, one year only after the formation of the American Congress, and eight months before it ventured on the declaration of independence.

"About the month of November, Congress was informed that a foreigner was then in Philadelphia, who was desirous of making to them an important and confidential communication. This intimation having been several times repeated, a committee, consisting of Mr. Jay, Dr. Franklin and Mr. Jefferson, was appointed to hear what the foreigner had to say. These gentlemen agreed to meet him in one of the committee rooms in Carpenters' Hall. At the time appointed they went there, and found already arrived an elderly lame gentleman, having the appearance of an old wounded French officer. They told him they were authorized to receive his communication. Upon which he said, 'that his most Christian majesty had heard with pleasure of the exertions made by the American colonies in defence of their rights and privileges ; that his majesty wished them success, and would, whenever it should be necessary, manifest more openly his friendly sentiments towards them.'

"The committee requested to know his authority for giving these assurances. He answered only by drawing his hand across his throat, and

saying, 'Gentlemen, I shall take care of my head.' They then asked, what demonstration of friendship they might expect from the king of France. 'Gentlemen,' answered the foreigner, 'if you want arms you shall have them; if you want ammunition you shall have it; if you want money you shall have it!' The committee observed, that these assurances were indeed important, but again desired to know by what authority they were made. 'Gentlemen,' said he, 'repeating his former gesture, I shall take care of my head;' and this was the only answer they could obtain from him. He was seen in Philadelphia no more. It was the opinion of the committee that he was a secret agent of the French court, directed to give them indirect encouragement, but in such a manner that he might be disavowed if necessary. Mr. Jay stated that his communications were not without their effect on the proceedings of Congress."—vol. i. p. 39, 40.

Notwithstanding these assurances, the French government did not commit themselves to an acknowledgment of American Independence until after the capture of General Burgoyne at Saratoga in 1777, and Spain, at this time their close ally, was still slower in bestowing her sanction on colonial insurrection. But as Spain was now at war with England, the Americans naturally hoped for her co-operation, and Mr. Jay undertook to break ground there in 1779. After a disastrous voyage, he landed at Cadiz, January 22d 1780, "not only an entire stranger, but without letters of introduction or bills of credit."—p. 106.

His object when he reached Madrid was to obtain a loan from the Spanish government, and the difficulty of the task may be best estimated by the extremity of the need which dictated it.

"Shortly after Mr. Jay's departure from America, Congress ordered bills to be drawn on him for more than half a million of dollars, payable six months after sight, in the hope that before that time he would have obtained a subsidy from the Spanish court. With these bills supplies were purchased for the army, and the holders sent them to their European correspondents, who presented them to Mr. Jay for payment. That Congress should have ventured on such a measure, not only without knowing that Mr. Jay could procure money in Spain, but even before they had heard of his arrival there, proves the desperate situation of their finances at the period of the revolution, and their conviction that the means of continuing the contest were to be provided for at every hazard. Similar bills were drawn upon Mr. Laurens, who had sailed as American minister for Holland; and unfortunately they arrived before the minister, who being captured by a British cruiser, was consigned to the Tower of London."—p. 108.

Confinement in the "towers of Julius" was not much worse than freedom at Madrid without money. Spain had not even recognized the existence of the United States, and as a previous condition she claimed the surrender of the navigation of the Mis-

issippi; a sacrifice in which nothing could induce Jay to concur. The expedient which he adopted shall be stated in his son's words :

“ Anxious to save the credit of his country, and regardless of personal consequences, he now took a step no less remarkable for its boldness and decision, than for its variance with his usual habits of prudence. He resolved to accept all bills that should be presented to him, thus making himself personally responsible for their payment. This was done for the purpose of preserving the credit of the United States for at least the ensuing six months, and in the hope that within that time supplies would be obtained from either Spain or France. On the 22d of September his acceptances amounted to 50,000 dollars. He then applied to the French court for assistance, and was informed that none could be afforded. It was not long however before he received from France, through Dr. Franklin, 25,000 dollars. This relief, small as it was, revived his hopes, and strengthened the resolution he had taken, and he continued to accept every bill that was presented.”—p. 109.

This willingness to run risks in the service of his country, contrasts strikingly with the prudence and frugality of Jay's personal habits; a frugality which Jefferson, if we rightly read his cypher,* seems to have thought a fit subject for a sneer, but which is obviously essential to the honest representative of a republic. Jay was now to fill this office in a yet more important scene. Relieved from his Spanish embarrassments by the success of Washington, he arrived at Paris in June, 1782, where, in conjunction with Mr. Adams and Dr. Franklin, he was empowered to conclude a peace with Great Britain.

One circumstance made this task peculiarly critical :—“ When you come to find by your instructions,” wrote Gouverneur Morris,† “ that you must ultimately obey the dictates of the French Minister, I am sure there is something in your bosom, which will revolt at the servility of the situation.”—p. 130. Congress, however, had acquiesced in this demand, and Mr. Jay's opposition to it seems to have been the ground of that bitter hatred which he ever afterwards experienced from the French party in the United States. Dr. Franklin submitted to it without reluctance, blinded, probably, by that hostility towards Great Britain which led him into the littleness of recalling private insults, when he appeared as the representative of a nation. But Jay, though his hereditary partialities might be supposed to favour the country of his ancestors, soon penetrated the designs of the French ministry. The independence of the United States once admitted by England,

* Vide Jefferson's Memoirs, ii. 326.

† “ A high-flying monarchy man,” according to Jefferson; apparently because he did not choose to submit to the French party.

they would stand in no need of the assistance of France and Spain. The necessity of conciliating their allies would not thenceforth oblige them to continue the war, nor would they, as the price of independence, be compelled to accept a disadvantageous peace. To obtain a recognition, therefore, previous to the treaty, was the object of America; an object to which England, weary of the war, offered no opposition. What then was the obstacle? Mr. Jay suspected that it was raised by the French Minister of War, the Count de Vergennes. His suspicions were soon confirmed by an intercepted letter from M. Marbois, the French Chargé d'Affairs, at Philadelphia, which betrayed the purposes of the French government in delaying the negociation. Fresh proof was derived from the attempts of Vergennes's secretary to induce the negociators to forego the Newfoundland fisheries and the navigation of the Mississippi, and from a private mission of the same party to England. Convinced at length of the treachery* which was intended, Mr. Jay induced his colleagues to sign a private treaty with Great Britain without the consent of the French minister. "Eh bien, mon amie," said next day the Spanish ambassador at Paris, tapping him good naturedly on the shoulder, "vous avez très bien fait."

Notwithstanding the success of his diplomacy, Mr. Jay seems to have had little relish for the employment, and declining any further engagement of the same kind, he entered, May, 1784, upon the office of Foreign Secretary to Congress. He could scarcely have been placed in a position where the deficiencies of the Union were more apparent. The people refused to pay their private debts to the subjects of Great Britain, the several states supported them, while the general government had no power to enforce obedience, or to fulfil its engagements towards foreigners. It was at this time that Jay is asserted, though without truth, to have meditated the revival of monarchy in the United States. The idea is expressly negatived by his confidential correspondence with Washington. "Shall we have a king? Not in my opinion, while other expedients remain untried. Might we not have a Governor-General, limited in his prerogatives or duration? Might not Congress be divided into an Upper and a Lower House, the former appointed for life, the latter annually?"—vol. i. p. 256.

* Mr. Jay seems to have suspected a much deeper plot on the part of the French, amounting even to a partition of the United States. It rested on the authority of a "Mr. Pultney," probably Sir William Pulteney, who was at Paris with his daughter at the time he mentions. For "Mally" read Mallet.

"New-made greatness doth forget men's names."

It seems that Republicans are not exempt from *ἡ λήθη των ονομάτων παρὰ μισῶν*. We have Hartly for Hartley, vol. i. p. 71; Struckey for Strachey, Tankenville for Tankerville.

Of these proposals a large part was carried into effect when the present constitution of the United States was adopted in the year 1788, and the dissolution of the Union, if not prevented, has been at least deferred. Nothing is more creditable to those eminent men to whom the change was owing, than that the detestation of injustice contributed as largely to their attempt as the apprehension of anarchy. In 1785 Mr. Jay "presented to Congress an elaborate report, in which he entered into a minute examination of the acts of the several states, and showed conclusively that Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Virginia, South Carolina, and New York, had each been guilty of violating the provisions of the treaty" with Great Britain. "Congress, in accordance with the advice of their secretary, called on the States to repeal such of their laws as were repugnant to the treaty: but unhappily they had no power to enforce the call. There was no federal judicature to which the injured and oppressed foreigner could appeal for protection against the vindictive and unjust enactments of the state legislatures."—p. 239, 241.

A democracy has no conscience. "I think," said Washington, when the degrading conduct of the local governments was brought before him, that "there is more wickedness than ignorance mixed with our councils.—Virtue, I fear, has in a great degree taken its departure from our land, and the want of disposition to do justice is the source of the national embarrassments."—p. 244. This distrust of his countrymen was Washington's feeling* to the last, and it was not likely to be removed by the conduct of the legislature of his own state, when ten years later it instructed its representative, Monroe, to move for the abrogation of that "article of the treaty of peace, which secured to British creditors the right of recovering in the United States their honest debts."—p. 314. "We have probably had too good an opinion of human nature in forming our confederation" are his emphatic words.—p. 247. The sole remedy appeared to be a federal government, which should be less immediately dependant on the will of the majority. Such a measure was proposed in 1787 by a congress consisting of the ablest men in the United States. Jay contributed greatly to its success, as well by his personal exertions in the legislature of New York, as by his contributions to "The Federalist," a publication in which he was joined by Alexander Hamilton, the ablest, probably, of American statesmen, and by Maddison, who afterwards courted popular favour by reversing his present measures. Their united efforts were successful; the federal constitution was accepted; Washington became first President, and Jay Chief Justice.

From the duties of this important office he was called in 1794

* Vide Jefferson's Correspondence.

to undertake a special embassy to England. The fever of French revolutionism was at that moment raging in North America, and but for Washington's personal influence she would have been entangled in the hostilities of Europe. He was nobly seconded by Jay, who, in contempt of the threats and violence of the partisans of France, conducted his embassy with honesty and success, and obtained for his country the advantages of a commercial treaty with Great Britain. On the state of parties in England he looked with a discerning eye; he saw the great popularity of the king, and the hearty concurrence which the nation gave to the war with France.—vol. ii. pp. 247, 250. His own inclinations, as he explains them to Washington, were favourable to those proposals for a negociation with France, which were made in parliament during his stay in London, and were productive of the conferences at Lisle.

“The minister would, I think, have stood on stronger ground if he had taken the first good opportunity of saying explicitly in the House of Commons that it was France who declared war against Great Britain, and not Great Britain who declared war against France, and that the government was disposed and ready to make peace, whenever France would do it on terms compatible with honour, &c.”—vol. ii. p. 249.

Mr. Jay was well received in England; Lord Grenville treated him with marked attention; and some of the most interesting letters in these volumes are from persons with whom he became acquainted in London. On his return to America in June, 1795, public reasons induced him to exchange his situation as Chief Judge for the less lucrative office of Governor of New York. To this post he had been elected some years before, but had been excluded by a political manœuvre,—falsification of votes,—on the part of the democrats.

Of his own high-minded repugnance to such practices,—the distinguishing merit of his character,—he gave a signal instance while Governor of New York. John Adams had by that time succeeded Washington in the Presidential chair, but with the political principles had not inherited the influence of his predecessor. Temporary circumstances, also, had alienated some of his partisans, so that the Presidential election in 1800 seemed likely to bring in Jefferson and anti-federalism. A greater evil could scarcely be inflicted on a nation than to place this bad man, a “fanatic in politics and infidel in religion,” in its highest office. But from the equal division of other votes, it soon appeared that the result would depend upon New York, which, by leaving the appointment of Presidential electors to its local assembly, gave its whole influence commonly to a single candidate. At this critical moment the Federalists lost their pre-

ponderance in the annual election for the New York legislature. One resource only was open to them. Some months must elapse before the new assembly would come into existence, while the old one, though its session had expired, was not extinct. If reassembled by the governor it could transfer the appointment of presidential electors from the state legislature to the people in districts, always a popular measure, and the division of votes thus produced would be almost as fatal to Jefferson as their concentration against him.

No appeal could be more trying than that made on this occasion to the governor. Providence seemed to have put in his hands his country's preservation. He was too good a man to be influenced by the personal hatred entertained for him by Jefferson, but he must have anticipated the various evils which resulted from a systematic attempt to undo what Washington and himself had effected. His conduct in other instances, more especially his opposition during the following year to the encroachments upon his legitimate authority, shows that he was not actuated by pusillanimity, and it is impossible therefore not to honour him for rejecting the proposal to reassemble the local legislature, as being, in his own words, "a measure for party purposes, which it would not become me to adopt."—vol. i. p. 414.

If such an example were needed anywhere it was under a republican government, of which the inherent vice is its want of fixed principles. When the voice of the people is admitted to be the voice of God, what human institutions can be too sacred to be assailed, or what divine laws? Reason and authority are equally unavailing, when the last decision of the majority is the standard of equity. It were well if this affected only the political arrangements of a republic, if such changes as that which Jay at this time prevented, and which twenty-four years afterwards,* under somewhat similar circumstances, he lived to witness, were alone to be apprehended. But it is the tendency of democracies to trample on natural as well as civil rights; to alter the standard of justice as well as of law. Of this the United States have given sufficient indication. It was one of their cardinal principles, (Jefferson brings it forward with no little éclat,) that the king did not possess the right which the usage of England gave him, to grant allotments of the unoccupied soil of the colonies. "All the lands," they said, within the limits which any society has circumscribed "around itself are assumed by that society, and subject to its allotment." (*Jeff. Memoirs*, i. 117.) That the crown of England possessed any right to dispose of the countries of which its

* Vide Basil Hall's *North America*.

subjects took possession we do not maintain; in this case the usage of Christendom is manifestly oppressive. But did the Americans abide by their declaration of rights? Their own new charters were hardly dry when they compelled the Indians to sell, at a nominal price, the territory of which their "particular society" had been in possession for countless centuries; so that in the same pages with this Bill of Rights to the American soil may be found Jefferson's concurrence in its infraction. (*Jeff.* i. 309.) The very debt incurred by the Americans in maintaining their own lands was thus paid by means of the expulsion of others. We are not at present concerned with the injustice of this, but with its inconsistency. Other cases (that of the Cherokees) might be more openly oppressive, but the calmness with which recent principles were forgotten best illustrates the habits of the animal called Democracy.

Jefferson's correspondence makes us acquainted with another example of the same kind. When Louisiana was ceded to the United States, its French inhabitants desired the same liberty which the British government had left to the Canadians whom it had conquered—the right of using their own laws. Perhaps the Canadians were too indulgently treated, yet the principle of interfering as little as possible with private liberty was excellent. But what said President Jefferson, whose whole life had been spent in maintaining the right of the several states to self-government. Through his creature, the Governor, he disallowed the decision of the local legislature, and proposed to swamp the French majority by settling 30,000 American volunteers within the limits which they had "circumscribed around" themselves. (*Jeff. Mem.* iv. 65.) The laws of nature would then doubtless have regained their authority, and the sentence of the majority would have been once more the voice of God.

These remarks proceed from no hostility to America, where there are as many probably who disapprove the injustice of the majority as in Great Britain. The popular unfairness is not their fault, but their misfortune. They are the more to be pitied because their very opinions are under bondage. They have not even the privilege to complain. We know nothing more galling to a generous mind than to be compelled to assent to the shallow sophisms of the vulgar, to restrain its thoughts to that sluggish motion with which inferior spirits can keep pace, and to submit to be the "man of the age." It is from the humiliation thus imposed on its public servants that the statesmen of America afford so lamentable a contrast to the heroes of its revolution. Not that we can trace its effect on individual character, but we think the Americans themselves cannot review the generation which sprang

up in more independent habits of thought without perceiving the degeneracy. "*Memoriam quoque ipsam cum voce perdidissemus si tam in nostra potentia esset oblivisci quam tacere.*"

The life of Jay affords many bitter traces of this feeling. And we are ourselves too near the danger to overlook them. Already do our republican periodicals insult us by the assumption that those who differ from the rabble must either be dishonest or infatuate. Let a man dissent from the popular cant of this shallow age, no matter how deeply conversant with the thoughts of the mightiest spirits of our race, no matter how refined his taste, how extensive his knowledge, how elevated his genius, and the pedants of the Mechanics' Institute will at once pronounce that he is of narrow and limited understanding. Now this assuredly is but the yell of the savage before he begins his work of blood. Were the majority really on the side of the liberty-mongers of the day, to differ from them would involve a bodily as well as a mental persecution. During the madness of the Reform Bill it was as dangerous for a Tory to vote in Roxburgshire as for a negro at Philadelphia, witness the motto of the Minto family, "*Burke Sir Walter;*" and the House of Commons has just shown that if men are not murdered as well as insulted during the next election, it will not be for want of impunity. As yet neither O'Connell nor the Lord Advocate have carried matters so far as the enlightened citizens of Missouri, and Lynch law has been more effective than Jedburg justice. But that it may be well understood to what point things are tending, we give, in parallel columns, a scene at Philadelphia and in the county of Limerick.

"I said one day to an inhabitant of Pennsylvania, 'Be so good as to explain to me how it happens that in a state founded by Quakers, and celebrated for its toleration, freed Blacks are not allowed to exercise civil rights. They pay the taxes: is it not fair that they should have a vote?'"

"'You insult us,' replied my informant, 'if you imagine that our legislators could have committed so gross an act of injustice and intolerance.'"

"'What, then the Blacks possess the right of voting in this country?'"

"'Without the smallest doubt.'"

"'How comes it then that in the polling-booth this morning I did not perceive a single negro in the whole meeting?'"

"At the opening of the Limerick County Court this day, a fourth candidate was put in nomination. The great body of farmers and peasantry arrived about 10 o'clock, exhibiting a demonstration of physical strength and of martial organization never exceeded at any contest for the representation of Limerick. The countrymen came regularly marshalled by their leaders, respectable farmers on horseback. The Roman Catholic priests were conspicuous before each troop.

"The booths were opened about 10 o'clock, but scarce a tally was entered for any candidate when a desperate assault was made upon Mr. Stafford O'Brien's committee-room with sticks, stones, and brickbats; the porters at

“‘This is not the fault of the law; the negroes have an undisputed right of voting; but they voluntarily abstain from making their appearance.’

“‘A very pretty piece of modesty on their parts, rejoined I.’

“‘Why the truth is that they are not disinclined to vote, but they are afraid of being maltreated: in this country the law is sometimes unable to maintain its authority without the support of the majority. But in this case the majority entertains very strong prejudices against the Blacks, and the magistrates are unable to protect them in the exercise of their legal privileges.’

“‘What, then the majority claims the right not only of making the laws, but of breaking the laws it has made?’”
Tocqueville's America. Reeve's Translation.

the entrance were both knocked down, and the gentlemen of the committee received several violent blows from missiles and sticks now put in requisition by the storming party. The police charged to the rescue with fixed bayonets, and relieved the gentlemen and agents of Mr. O'Brien from their imminently perilous situation, or otherwise, in a few minutes, there is no doubt they would each and all have been sacrificed by the sanguinary miscreants, whose object was evidently slaughter on the instant.

“Mr. L. O'Brien withdrew from the contest, and would not prosecute a poll when his agents and voters were in peril of their lives. It was understood that he was at this moment in a majority in the morning's poll.”—*Times, Aug. 14, 1837.*

In neither of these cases has there been any attempt to remedy so monstrous a state of things; “he that is in the lion's clutches knows it were useless.” The Whigs continue to descant on the peace, order, and happiness of Ireland under the Mulgrave rule, as though the enormity we have described had been in one of his lordship's novels, not in a county which he was bound to protect; the perfect equality of their unrivalled constitution remains the favourite subject of congratulation at Philadelphia.

That a happier state of things as yet prevails in this country is owing, under Providence, to two causes—local institutions and an endowed Church. Did space permit, a curious contrast might be drawn between the conduct of our republicans in endeavouring to disturb our local liberties, and the opposition of the American democrats to centralization. The cause is the same, different as is the effect. The central government in America is less subject to the immediate control of the populace than the local legislatures; our agitators find officials in London more flexible than the independent institutions which have hitherto ramified through the national frame. Hence the wish or attempt to subject the magistracy and police to the home office, to put a minister of public instruction over schools, to abandon the poor to the three kings of Somerset House; political privileges being the alleged gain, the real loss, personal freedom.

But we turn to that, to which the work before us invites, the national effect of our ecclesiastical institutions. The good man whose life is detailed in these volumes had been brought up a churchman, and in the Episcopal communion he died. In 1801

he retired from public life, glad apparently to escape from the overbearing tyranny of the prevalent demagogues, and fixed himself in a retired situation about fifty miles from New York. Here the newspapers could reach him but once a week to remind him of "the vanity of expecting that from the perfectibility of human nature and the lights of philosophy, the multitude will become virtuous and wise or their demagogues candid and honest." (vol. i. p. 431.) "As to myself," he says in an interesting letter to Mr. Wilberforce, "both gratitude and resignation have strong claims to my attention. To find myself at this period of my life, and after so many years spent in affairs which naturally caused solicitude, placed by Providence in my present tranquil comfortable situation, is particularly grateful to my feelings." After mentioning some domestic trials, he resumes, "to *you* it will be an obvious reflection, that checkered scenes belong to a state of probation: and that being here as birds on their passage, this is not the proper place for us to build our nests."—vol. i. p. 432.

He had formed a right estimate of the only durable possession which man can raise, when he was "instrumental in erecting an Episcopal Church" in the neighbourhood of his new dwelling. And here it is natural to observe the source of that temper and moderation which marked his course. Whether men believe in religion or not—whether they suppose it but the disguise which is assumed in public, or are acquainted with its private benefits—yet that it does in fact exercise large influence over mankind is what cannot be controverted. Be it their weakness or their wisdom, men are bound together by the tie of a common faith, and its absence is a diminution of their national identity. When it is asked, then, why Jay, not of English ancestry, whose family had undergone real suffering from despotic power, displayed a fairness and moderation so unusual around him, we answer, that he was a member of the English Church. Had this "cheap defence of nations" taken firmer root, the battle of Bunker's Hill would never have been fought, nor Washington sacked by a hostile armament.

Yet it must not be supposed that Jay was a well-instructed Churchman. How could he be so? The Church of England had indeed spread her branches over her colonies, but she had never taken root there. He admits, indeed, "that Episcopacy was of Apostolic institution"—vol. i. p. 435; but of the real office of a bishop he seems to have been about as ignorant as our countrymen of the privileges of a Mohawk chieftain. And what else could be expected? Had he been taught to regard the Bishops of the Church Catholic as the highest depositories of those mystic gifts, which it has pleased the Lord of all to commit

to "earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power" might still be His? Had he learnt in youth to reverence the Apostolic office, by being brought at Confirmation into personal union with the whole system of the Church? What wonder if an American should think but little of an institution which had never shown itself on his native soil? If he should be ignorant that men, of whom he had heard but as lords of parliament, were in truth the successors of the Apostles? It is not strange, then, that he should have objected to the terms in which they were addressed by the American clergy as too "reverential," i. 253; or that he should have known no difference between the self-deputed Episcopacy of Denmark, and that which can trace its origin to the twelve disciples. All this is explained as naturally as the phenomenon so gravely set forth by Reid and Matthison in their visit to the (so called) American Churches, that while the Episcopal communion was endowed in Virginia its numbers declined, and that its revival might be dated from the plunder of its revenues. But under what circumstances did its numbers decline? Was it an Apostolic community, such as Ignatius would have recognized, or to which the exhortations of St. John might have been addressed? Alas, its rites had never been fully solemnized—the young had never known the ordinance by which the benefits of baptism are recalled—the congregation never met under consecrated roof—the dead did not lie in a hallowed soil! The light might indeed be there, but instead of being in its candlestick, it was laid under a bushel. We know with what scorn such arguments are received by the scoffer and the infidel, but we beg leave to remind them, that were religion as false as their own shallow ethics, yet not Hume or Carlisle can deny that the majority of men profess to believe it; and further, that, as members of the Church, we are not called upon to account for phenomena except upon her principles. Inasmuch, then, as the Church of Christ has ever held the bishop to be the centre of all spiritual union, and that the gifts of grace are disseminated through him over the mystic body, she does not teach us to expect that a branch could flourish which had never been truly rooted in the soil. To this state of things succeeded the revolutionary war; the bitterness of politics was added to that of schism; and such was the hostility towards those families which were by position most connected with the English Church, that "at this day," says Jefferson in 1813, "unpopularity continues attached to their names. A Randolph, a Carter, or a Burwell, must have great personal superiority over a common competitor to be elected by the people."—*Jefferson's Cor.*

At length the infection of English alliance passed away. We rejoice to find the Virginian Church flourishing like a palm-

tree, though Messrs. Reid and Matthison can extract gall from its healing branches. We do not stop to say more of their work, though we must observe the unfairness of a comparison between the number of communicants in a church where the Eucharist is constantly administered according to the usage of early times, and a society where the communion is a profession of faith rather than a mean of spiritual blessing. To hasten to our immediate subject, the national influence of a Church independent by its endowments of popular caprice, and exempted by its Episcopal order from popular control. Of all preservatives of liberty, none is more important than the barrier thus formed against any sudden movement of the popular will. The insulation of a large portion of the most cultivated part of society from the ordinary current, its addiction to pursuits which lie apart from men's daily business, affords a constant corrective to those impulses by which the popular mind is led astray. It is the lake which moderates the else overflowing ebullitions of the tide of life—the fly-wheel which gives stability to the irregular impulses of society. Opinions receive gradually a new stamp—politicians learn the effect of principles—even political economists acquire wisdom. When can this be more clearly evidenced than in North America? That a species of religion prevails in that country we do not question. Men cannot live in comfort without some faith which may enable them to die. But its religious system is the disciple, not the instructress of the people. It does not lead, but follow. It is but the echo of their voice—how can it alter the tide by which it is borne? Is there a crime, like the oppression of their negro brethren, which is sanctioned by the law of the multitude;—Christianity shuts herself up for a season like Tamerlane while the streets of Aleppo were flowing with blood, and discusses abstract questions instead of checking the excesses of her subjects.

“Frangimur heu fatis inquit, ferimurque procella.

Nec plura locutus

Sepsit se tectis rerumque reliquit habenas.”

Whence comes it that in “religious America,” when excesses have been committed, worse than the massacre at Thessalonica, no St. Ambrose has arisen to control the people? It was a natural complaint in the civil authority, “there is no bringing a people to justice;” but where was the Church, which is bound by its office to war with the passions of the multitude?

That the Church of this country has often withstood a popular delusion, we learn from the confession of its enemies. In 1833, the majority of the clergy, though anxious to see the representative system freed from corruption, yet opposed the reckless and unnecessary violation of private rights and established usage.

In the popular publications of that day, the clergy, we must all remember, were charged with setting themselves in opposition to the public will, and were menaced with the national vengeance. Now that the delusion has passed away, the clergy are but the more respected for their independence. What is the history of the Non-jurors—the best part of our Church during the last century—but a refusal to partake in popular crimes? We doubt not that there are those in America, who would be equally willing to witness for the truth by their private sufferings, but how could they bear the same testimony against national apostacy? It is the existence of a priesthood neither immediately dependent on popular bounty, nor amenable to popular will, which alone can produce this salutary effect. Some real independence is wanted—not that of the Congregational Union—a sect which, by a strange anomaly, has adopted the name, because its teachers are *not* independent, just as those call themselves baptists, whose children are *not* baptised.

Strange it is that to the blessings which such an institution has conferred on this country, our colonies have not been admitted. There was a time, indeed, when something better might have been hoped. In the year 1713, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel expressed its belief, that during the next year two bishops would be settled in our Western Colonies. What had happened during the previous thirteen years since Dr. Bray had given birth to an interest in the cause of missions, might at that moment have warranted expectations of the most sanguine success. But the next year saw power conferred upon a party systematically opposed to the extension of the Church. While the star of Walpole was in the ascendant, while Hoadley predominated over the clergy, what efforts could be expected? Sir Robert Walpole is said to have declared, that he did not venture on so dangerous an experiment as that of taxing the colonies, but he took a surer mode of destroying their attachment to the mother state, when he prevented the enterprising Berkeley from making the Bermudas the focus of their religious and intellectual growth. Unhappily during that very period, when the moral blight of latitudinarian indifference overspread the land, did the colonial system of Great Britain receive its direction. It bore token to the unwholesome atmosphere around it. So deep rooted was the evil that its very propriety was hardly questioned, and even Secker could consent to withhold the advantage of Church offices from the continent of America, if the attempt was supposed to be hostile to the administration of the day. For more than half a century did this state of things continue, and it was not till the celebrated resolutions which were moved by Mr. Wilberforce, in

1793, that the duty of a Christian government towards its dependences was even in form admitted.

The public judgment is now happily improved. But any efficient attempts to evangelize our wide-spread empire, are as much prevented as ever by sectarian jealousy. What indifference did in the last century, is done in this by misdirected zeal. That even the Dissenters ought not, on their own principles, to oppose a systematic attempt for the foundation of the Church throughout our wide dominions—that their jealousy is little less unreasonable on their own principles than on ours, we may show on some other occasion. Meanwhile let us express our deep regret that our own rulers are still forgetful of that simplest of all truths, that Churches, like individuals, must live by FAITH. The Ministry and the Radicals have agreed between them, it seems, that no provision shall be made for a bishop in Lower Canada. But does not Canada contain Christian souls in the unity of our Church? Ought they to be deprived of the blessings of ancient order? Such an income is not provided as befits a lord—but is a nation to be without its Apostle? Cannot He who founded the Church raise up friends for its support, or can no munificence be expected till men have ceased to be Christians? Where had been our own succession, if such cowardly policy had prevailed? Our ministers cannot be more careless about the Church than a well-remembered ruler at Corinth, and among its peddling Jews must have been many a forgotten maligner no less bitter than the member for Kilkenny. When will the time come that the Church of England, the noblest institution which it has pleased God to exhibit to mankind, shall go forth without fear upon its appointed task—trusting to its commission, not its wealth—not to acts of parliament, but to the precepts of its Founder—and determined that British speech and British law shall not be more widely spread over the globe, than its own sacred deposit—the everlasting line of the Apostles?

ART. VII.—*The Prose Works of the Right Rev. Father in God Thomas Ken, D.D., some time Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells; to which are added some of his Letters (never before published), and a short account of his Life.* By William Hawkins, Esq., his Executor. The whole collected by James Thomas Round, B.D., Rector of St. Runwald's and St. Nicholas, Colchester, and late Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford. London: Rivingtons. Parker, Oxford. Albin, Colchester. 1838.

It is one of the greatest comforts remaining to us in these days of novelty and excitement, to reflect that we are not yet so far advanced in modern enlightenment as to be blind to the wisdom of the ages which have gone before us. Every month is discovering to us fresh stores from the piety and zeal of our forefathers. Many are yet left who are thoughtful enough to perceive that our advancement in secular and religious knowledge has been in an inverse ratio. Yet there is a difficulty in finding those who, having been brought up under the existing system of religious education and religious practice, shall stand up single-handed to protest against it. We have great reason, therefore, to be sincerely thankful to those, who in these days of degeneracy and defection, instead of timidly or indolently acquiescing in low views and careless practice, have marked out for themselves the delightful task of examining the writings and studying the example of those fathers and confessors of our Church whose principles and conduct have come nearest to a realization of its acknowledged theory. The dead may thus stand up as censors and correctors with better effect than the living, and as their works are from time to time rescued from oblivion, they seem raised as it were from the grave to rebuke us. We are divided in the present age between a restless spirit of innovation, which outstrips all rules, and a timid acquiescence in existing practice; we either take things as we found them, or, dissatisfied with them as we found them, we try to frame them to our own fancies. We contrive thus to reconcile ourselves to the loss of catechetical instruction, to the disuse of the daily service, to the scanty opportunities afforded still in many places for the Holy Communion, to the want of Church discipline, and to the most flagrant encroachments of Erastianism—partly by contemplating the difficulties which stand in the way of a sounder practice, and partly by reflecting how wants have often providentially been supplied, and dwelling on points in which our system has, on the whole, though in spite of itself, worked well. Still the question is, whether we are concerned to maintain the real theory of the Church of England, or

are to be contented with confirming precedents, however old and numerous, which must be seen to be deviations from that theory. If she assumes a general system of catechetical instruction,—if she provides a morning and evening sacrifice of prayer and praise, and enjoins frequent communion,—if, again, she laments her want of discipline, and even assumes its existence in all her occasional services,—and if she holds a theory of alliance with the state, which is not Erastian, however inveterately her practice may have been so; in all these cases we surely are bound to uphold her acknowledged theory, so far as we can, to strive to realise it in our measure; and where we cannot, where we are obliged to acquiesce in evils which we cannot remedy, where we cannot be active but must be passive, we are still nevertheless concerned not to defend, but to protest firmly and temperately against prescriptive abuses, and instead of casting about for reasons why this or that privilege may be dispensed with, or devising new methods of our own for removing confessed difficulties, to look back, as we have said, to those who have most fully understood our Church, and most nearly realised its system, and who by their works and their example call us back to the faith and practice of our forefathers, and challenge our firm and affectionate allegiance to the ancient Church of England.

Of these perhaps there is no one who will be seen to speak and exhort and rebuke us with all authority more effectively than Bishop Ken;—no one who comes more nearly up to the character of a Christian Bishop, of being “blameless, vigilant, sober, of good behaviour, given to hospitality, apt to teach, patient,” and most entirely disinterested; nor perhaps can there be found a more perfect “example to the believers in word, in conversation, in charity, in spirit, in faith, in purity.” We believe that there is no character from whose life and writings we could more fully and literally exemplify every single point in these passages than that of Bishop Ken. We know of none more keenly alive to the importance of his sacred office, and the necessity of preserving the “depositum,” that good thing committed to him, and yet who entered more minutely into the lowest and simplest practical duties of the Christian ministry.

We have been glad, therefore, on many accounts, to hear his name revived amongst us, to find his example quoted, and, more especially, now, to see a collection of his Prose Works.

We have been much struck also at finding, on the same table with them at the booksellers, a work of Ken’s intimate friend, Bishop Turner, of which we never before have heard;—a memoir of the excellent Nicholas Ferrar, of Little Gidding; and we cannot refrain from making a few remarks on the fact, that the works

of two old and dear friends, who began life together, who rose together to the same high office, should have been brought to light again within a few months of each other, and be found side by side after having lain more than a century in neglect and obscurity. The two books, from the very nature of their subjects, are not unlikely in many instances to fall into the same hands,—and a few words on the friendship which subsisted between them may be interesting, though we have no intention of entering further into the works of Bishop Turner, and purpose to confine ourselves to remarks on those of Bishop Ken.

Ken has been long with us, and has been daily in the mouths of many who have known little or nothing more than his name. His Morning and Evening Hymns have been even adopted by almost universal consent into our Churches, and have crept, we know not how, in fragments, into the end of our Prayer-Books. His “Manual for the Use of Winchester Scholars” has been on the list of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge probably from the very time when that venerable Society was founded under the good auspices of men who well knew and loved the author, and admired the deep and natural piety which shone so conspicuously in his life and breathes throughout his works. His “Directions for Prayer for the Diocese of Bath and Wells,” taken from the Church Catechism, have been preserved on the same lists, though the small demand for them would argue that they have either been unknown or forgotten, or, at all events, very far less valued and understood than they deserve. His name too is known to many of us, as connected with that of Robert Nelson, the prayers in whose “Practice of true Devotion” breathe very much the same tone with many of Ken’s, and who has adopted into that work the Morning, and Evening, and Midnight Hymns. A few years since, a small but fair Selection was made from his other poems, but we are not aware whether the impression was a large one, or whether it has been extensively sold.

Ken, then, has been known, and long held in esteem amongst us. He is remembered also as one of the famous Seven Bishops who were imprisoned by King James, and as one of the nine Non-juring bishops who were afterwards deprived by William. But both his works and his character are far less known than they should be. The “Short Account of his Life, with the two Sermons,” published in the beginning of the last century by his executor, has become very rare. His work on the Church Catechism, his “Prayers for the use of the Bath,” and “Pastoral Discourse for Lent,” have been long well nigh forgotten. We are therefore sincerely thankful to those who have collected his writings, and

have added such further information respecting him, and furnished us with such original documents as may tend to raise a deep interest in his character, and to throw light on parts of it which have been from time to time misinterpreted or inadequately understood.

Of Bishop Turner we know but little. We have, indeed, seen some sermons of his, preached on public occasions, and we have heard or read of others; in particular, that he preached the Coronation sermon of King James II. and his Queen, a circumstance which probably ever after gave him so eager and zealous an interest in the fate of his Royal Master. But before we took up the little memoir of Ferrar, to which we have alluded, and which we suppose to have been until very lately in private hands, we knew nothing of any other production of his pen. We know him, chiefly, as the early and attached friend of Bishop Ken. They were together as boys at Winchester; they were admitted, within a year of each other, as Fellows of New College—Turner in 1655, and Ken in 1657. They were consecrated within a year of each other; Turner, in 1683, to the bishoprick of Rochester, from whence he was translated, in 1684, to Ely,—and Ken, in 1684, to the bishoprick of Bath and Wells. They were both speakers in the remarkable conversation which took place between King James and the Seven Bishops, on their delivery of their famous petition against his Declaration of indulgence. They became, in consequence, fellow-prisoners in the Tower, and they both finally underwent the unrighteous sentence of deprivation for refusing to take the new oaths of allegiance to William and Mary, on the 1st of February, 1690. Although their views, after this, differed, and they took distinct courses, as their characters widely differed, we know of no interruption of their long and sincere attachment; and it is remarkable that two friends so united should form representatives of the two distinct classes of Non-jurors.

Ken is always regarded as the meekest and most peaceful; Turner is known as the most stirring and active of the deprived bishops. Ken is known as having been strongly opposed to the carrying on of the succession by clandestine consecrations. Turner was vigorous in forwarding those measures which were adopted for that purpose. He was the bishop who drew the attention of his brethren to the papers of Dr. Barwick, in which the plans had been laid down for continuing the Apostolical Succession in England, as the sees had gradually become vacant during the great Rebellion, and on which Bishop Lloyd, of Norwich, acted, when, under what they considered like difficulties, he determined, with some of his brethren, to continue the succession.

Ken was from the first entirely averse to those political views which, from time to time, influenced others; and when, soon after the Revolution, on one occasion, the hopes of the Jacobites seemed to be reviving, he was most anxious to discourage and check them. He knew that principles had been then admitted, the fruits of which would remain for posterity, and which no political changes could correct; and he declared with great earnestness and concern, we are told, as under a sort of divine impulse, that it was then but "the beginning of evils." The vigorous and warm heart of Turner, on the other hand, involved him in great difficulties. He was in such constant and close communication with Henry Lord Clarendon, that he was suspected of being engaged with him in a plot for the restoration of the King; and so far, it seems, with reason, that he exposed not only himself but his brethren to the suspicious jealousy of the government, and was obliged to abscond. Ken retired almost immediately to the hospitable and quiet asylum offered him by Lord Weymouth at Long Leate. We know, indeed, that in the first instance he retired to his diocese to avoid appearing in the House of Lords; but we find from the diary of Lord Clarendon, that, on his return to London, he joined his friends and companions in trouble. Towards the end of the year 1689, and in the beginning of the year 1690, we find him with the Bishop of Ely at Lambeth Palace; he was probably staying with his friend Turner at Ely House, the bishop's town residence; and at his country house at Putney, where we find occasionally the deprived Bishops of Norwich, Gloucester, and Peterborough, and Lord Clarendon and the excellent Charles Leslie. But he saw enough, probably, of the questions which from time to time were mooted, to render him glad to escape from such controversies, and to withdraw to his retreat in the country. Turner probably remained chiefly in London and its neighbourhood with Bishop Lloyd. He was one of the three consecrators of Bishops Hicke and Wagstaffe, a ceremony which took place at Bishop White's lodgings (the deprived Bishop of Peterborough), at Southgate, in February, 1693, on St. Matthias's Eve. He is mentioned also in company with Bishop Lloyd, together with forty non-juring clergy, attending the funeral of their deprived brother of Peterborough, at the Church of St. Gregory's by St. Paul's, in June, 1698. His sympathies were clearly more with these than with his old friend Ken, but he is said to have reflected much on many points in his life, and to have been so sincere as to condemn himself in those instances in which he conceived he had acted unworthily of his sacred order and station, before his death, which took place in the year 1700.

We have interesting evidence remaining of the anxiety of the

two friends respectively to influence each other. We are informed that Ken, who saw, no doubt, the difficulties on both sides, was at one time half persuaded by his friend Hooper, then rector of Lambeth, to take the oaths; and the conversations between them took place at the time when such frequent conferences were being held amongst the deprived bishops, hard by, at the palace. His situation between the palace and the rectory must have been truly painful and perplexing. He subsequently withdrew from Dr. Hooper's, which he had made his home after the Revolution, to his diocese; and it was during his absence that Bishop Turner, whom he had at length made his confidant, wrote the following anxious letter to the archbishop, dated Ascension Day, 1689:

"When I took my leave yesternight, I had no thought of waiting upon you again till this day sennight; but when I came home I found a letter to Mrs. Gregg from the Bishop of Bath and Wells, and this advertisement in it for me—'Tell my friend I will meet him at dinner at Lambeth, upon Saturday.' I suppose he does not know your Grace has left off dining publicly, as you have great reason to do. But since, my lord, you are pleased to give every one of your sons a day, as you obligingly express it, I must needs say the sooner we meet our brother of Bath the better, for I must no longer in duty conceal it from your Grace, tho' I beseech you to keep it in terms of a secret, that this very good man is, I fear, warping from us and the true interest of the Church of England, towards a compliance with the new government. I received an honest letter from him, and a friendly one, wherein he argues very wrong to my understanding, but promises and protests he will keep himself disengaged till he debates things over again with us, and that he was coming up again for that purpose. My Lord Bishop of Norwich has seen such another letter from him to my Lord of Gloucester; and upon the whole matter, our Bishop of Norwich, if your Grace thinks fit, will meet us on Saturday. I must needs wish my Lord of Chichester would be there to help us, for it would be extremely unhappy should we at this pinch lose one of our number. I apprehend that parson of Lambeth has superfined upon our brother of B. and W., and if he lodges again at his house, I shall doubt the consequence, for which reason I'll come over on Saturday morning to invite him to my country house."

Such was the array of powers drawn up by Bishop Turner to meet the scruples of his friend. The result is well known; Ken's single eye withstood the casuistry of his friend Hooper, who never ventured again to urge him on the subject; and we can see from the letters which Ken wrote some years after, when the question of "abjuration" came on, that his sentiments remained unaltered.

On the other hand, it appears from the letters to Hickes, now first published, that Ken had often and often lamented to his

brother of Ely the continuance of the schism ; and that after Turner's death, he urged the same arguments to Hickes.

Such, however, were the views respectively of Ken and Turner, and the connection between them ; and the account we have given of the latter will make such a narrative as that now published, of the primitive discipline and orderly devotion which was observed in the family at Little Gidding, doubly interesting. We are, indeed, unable in most cases to determine where the original narrator ends, and where the editor, who has connected and methodized the memoirs, begins : nor do we know at what period of his life Bishop Turner wrote them, nor whence he obtained his materials ; as the death of Ferrar, in 1637, must have been just about coincident with the birth of his biographer. But the bishop comes before us in a new light altogether, when we find him no longer the animated and eager non-juror, but the quaint and simple historian of a life spent in seclusion and devotion, counting the hours of worship, and minutely describing the prayers and praises of this quiet Christian household. For Little Gidding, which we have hitherto been acquainted with through the account of Dr. Peckard, " was in England, it has been observed, what Port-Royal was in France. Ardent devotion to the Redeemer characterized both. In each, peace, charity, good order, love to the souls and bodies of men, were eminently exhibited ; upon each the hand of persecution fell with unrelenting severity." We have said, we know not how the mind of Turner was directed to this subject, but we think that both the choice of the subject itself, and the way in which it is treated, have thrown a new light on the character of the narrator. There is in those parts, which are expressly quoted as Turner's, a delightful quaintness, and honesty, and good sense ; and a reality which compels us to think him in full earnest when he declares his conviction that the devout and holy life of Ferrar was " not only admirable but imitable." We may rejoice to think how fully he would see the meek wisdom, the retired and tranquil spirit, the wakeful, regular, and fervent piety, the rigid self-denial and overflowing charity of Ferrar, realized in the character and life of his own dear friend and companion Ken, and might dwell on the careful discipline and cheerful primitive devotion of this English Port Royal, as a model for that little Communion in which he felt so deep an interest amidst the enmity and persecution which assailed it—the Communion of the Non-jurors.

The substance, however, of Bishop Turner's book, we leave to others ; our more immediate concern is with Bishop Ken. " The greater part of the following collection," Mr. Round tells us, in his preface, " was published in separate pieces by Bishop

Ken in his lifetime. Two of the sermons were printed after his death by his great nephew and executor, Mr. Hawkins. Some of the letters were printed for the first time by the Rev. W. L. Bowles in his life of the bishop. The rest of them were never published before. Some of these were in the possession of the Rev. Dr. Williams, Head Master of Winchester College, and some were in the Bodleian Library." And all of them are in various ways of great interest and value. Mr. Round expresses his fears that some of the remains of Bishop Ken have escaped his inquiries, and proceeds to mention several works which he has excluded from the collection as spurious. He has prefixed to the collection the "Short Account" of Ken's Life, by Hawkins. Of the omitted works, whether genuine or spurious, we will say a few words presently.

But we cannot help, in the first place, expressing our regret that Mr. Round, instead of merely prefixing the "Short Account" of Hawkins, should not have given us a more full view of the life and character and principles of Bishop Ken. We have said that he seems as literally and entirely to illustrate the Scripture characteristics of a Christian bishop as any one of whom we know; that he is one whose character is one of singular importance in these days of degeneracy and defection, because he seems in his life and writings very nearly to exemplify the *theory* of the Church of England; to have felt and developed its Catholic principles and Catholic spirit; and to have exhibited in his own person, as well as in his writings, in a most remarkable and signal manner, the unfeigned love, joy, peace, long suffering, gentleness, faith, meekness, and temperance, which are the proper fruits of that good Spirit by which we believe it to be guided. And when we spoke of the characteristics of a Christian bishop above, and of these constituent parts of the Christian temper here, we mean, that the words may be most literally interpreted, and most closely applied. And if this be the case, no one, as was said before, can be raised who can be a more effectual witness against weak or loose principles in the views of the clergy, or careless practice in both clergy and laity, than Bishop Ken. Yet he is really, on the whole, but little known. His works are few, and have been hitherto scattered, and most of them rare. As a poet, those few to whom his writings are known have too often spoke of their tameness without seeing the bearing which many parts of them had on his own character and circumstances; and as his works have been scattered and rare, so has his character been in like manner disjointed and unknown. The Edinburgh reviewer, indeed, in his discourses on Mr. Bowles's so-called "Life of Ken," spoke slightly of the subject, and questioned its im-

portance altogether : and, in truth, we need not wonder that, if he were left to his own unaided wit and patience, to pick the mangled fragments of the good bishop from the miscellaneous reveries of his modern biographer, and then to his own unaided skill to combine them, we need not and cannot wonder if both his patience and his skill failed him, and that he obtained no definite portraiture, nay, scarcely so much as a whole feature of Ken; he could, therefore, for this, among other reasons, be in no sort a judge of the importance attaching to him, or of the very striking wholeness and almost angelic beauty of his character.

It is true it would be a work of no trifling difficulty to comprehend and delineate it; it is a task from which his relative and executor himself shrunk. "He was not so bold," he says, "as to sum up the character of such a man; he had neither leisure nor opportunity to search for particular facts, and a large account of his life would require a more able and polite genius and pen." How far it has met with these, we have too much respect for Mr. Bowles's age and name to inquire; yet we have never taken up the book without mingled sorrow and vexation, both on account of the dead and of the living, and wonder what could have tempted Mr. Bowles, "in spite of nature and his stars," to write on a subject which we are astonished to find he could at once so devotedly admire and so little understand. The compiler of the article Ken, in the *Biographia Britannica*, has bestowed much pains on various points which were passed over by Hawkins, and which Mr. Bowles has not touched. But the whole matter is as yet undigested, and it would seem to have remained for one who has taken so great an interest in collecting Ken's works, to collect the scattered facts which could be found concerning him, and to concentrate the light which he must have seen to have been poured in from these various sources, upon one of the most real and perfect characters with whom we are acquainted; one certainly which it will be both interesting and profitable to set before us in this particular age in which our lot is cast;—which is singularly calculated to explain to us the depth of the system under which we live, and, instead of allowing us to innovate,—to throw us back upon that system,—to call upon us to inquire how that sacred system may best be acted up to. Ken would make the clergy, from the highest order to the lowest, in the best sense, and to the best purpose dissatisfied with themselves; and less and less disposed to acquiesce in the existing *practice* of the Church of England, at the same time that he will as surely convince and satisfy them that her *theory* in government and discipline and doctrine is in the main good, and may be, what our enemies deny it ever has been or ever can be, realised.

Next, we should have been glad to have seen a fuller preface, because there is a further question more especially connected with the name of Bishop Ken, which, though it is, as we shall see, connected with his character, is nevertheless in itself quite independent of it, and involves great principles hitherto either very warmly and unprofitably, or very inadequately canvassed. We have seen that "his opinion was not agreeable with such of the non-jurors as were for continuing a separation by private consecrations among themselves." His executor states, in the "Short Account," that Ken's opinion on this head "might (should there be any good occasion) best be known by his answers to letters written from men of learning, who conversed with him on that subject;" and which he left behind him. Now the judgment of Bishop Ken in this case is so often quoted in defence of all sorts of acquiescence in existing difficulties and abuses, and his character so uniformly held up as a peace-maker, that we cannot but regard this very time, in which some of his most interesting letters on the subject have been brought forward, a very "good occasion" to examine the explanation afforded by them of the motives and principles on which he acted on various occasions, more or less connected with this continuance of the Non-juring succession. The meekness and great sweetness of his temper are frequently spoken of; and they are most rightly recommended to the notice and imitation of those who, in times of excitement, like those in which we live, are ready to come forward and speak out, when need requires it, on the various great questions which from time to time are started, and which will always receive more or less light from the disputes which agitated and distracted the Church in his time. These matters must necessarily be of intense interest to us, when we see it urged strongly, on the one hand, that his conduct is "*a good lesson to us, when division for nothing seems one of our dangers and one of our sins;*" and find some regretting on the other hand that the "*non-juring communion has not been perpetuated amongst us.*" They point out the "*position of Bishop Ken as truly magnificent had he boldly excommunicated, or deprived all who acknowledged the state bishops, and carried on the succession.*" In other words, we find the situation in which we stand at this moment running up into the difficulties and intricacies which perplexed the two classes of non-jurors, and discover ourselves to be reaping the fruit of those evils which Ken foresaw must arise from the opinions and practices then admitted, and which, perhaps, his maintenance of his claims, for aught we can tell, *might have failed as truly as his resignation of his claims has failed to remedy.*

We know the dilemma which may be raised on this doubtful

matter. *If* Ken was *right*, it is said, then all was set at rest; the grievances of the Church of England need not be too nicely investigated; the system has, on the whole, worked well ever since, and we had better, therefore, peacefully and quietly submit to various inconveniences, and preserve a good understanding with the civil power, and uphold "the Church as by law established." *If*, on the other hand, Ken was *wrong*, and yet, notwithstanding, the Catholic communion of the Non-jurors has ceased, then it will be urged that, since the time of the extinction of that communion, we can be scarcely said to have had a Church in England. Such are the arguments and inferences which those more particularly who, in these days, would defend the Church as an establishment, and overlook its spiritual safeguards, are anxious to ground upon the non-juring question. Yet, to take the first case, we believe nothing can possibly be more unfair or untenable, than to interpret Ken's resignation under perplexities which he felt and owned, into a sanction of the principles on which the then established Church had acted, or into a contented admission of such intrusions as must at all times endanger the sacred "depositum," which it was the main object of his life to keep inviolate, and to hand on unimpaired. Ken abhorred the Latitudinarianism which the moral and political views, established or countenanced by the Revolution, had introduced into the moral system; and he saw, with evil forebodings, the practical mischiefs of those encroachments which Erastianism had made upon the sacred functions of the Church. These points were so entirely uppermost in his thoughts, that they have called forth Mr. Bowles's mingled pity and almost contempt,—who speaks of them as bugbears and spectres which haunted Ken in his solitude. But we have lived to see the truth of Ken's forebodings,—we have been reserved for an age in which we can see their reality, and may fully convince ourselves why he had reason to fear them. At all events, we are bound in fairness to look at the positive, quite as carefully as at the negative, side of his character; and to see, as best we may, by the light of those facts and documents which we may be able to obtain, *what he actually did* to maintain the ground which he considered sacred, rather than to dwell on what he *did not*, because we believe that the measures which he certainly approved would be started at, and almost disclaimed, by those who profess to be most determined by his authority. Above all, we are bound to clear away all those worldly arguments which are too apt to enter into our calculations, in these days, on such subjects, and which never once can be supposed to have crossed Ken's mind, when he did what he thought his best towards

healing, be it remembered, a *divided* Church, not towards joining an *established* one.

Again, neither is it true to suppose that, *if* Ken was *wrong* in resigning, and at the same time the succession of the Non Jurors has ceased, the other part of the dilemma will follow, which is sometimes tauntingly put as a *reductio ad absurdum* of the question, viz. that there has been no Church in England since the extinction of the so-called Catholic Communion of the Non Jurors. This question was, in fact, very early anticipated in the "Christian Communion" of Kettlewell; and, so far, a foundation was laid for the principles on which Ken acted, in the chapter in which Kettlewell argues that the "ordinations of anti-bishops, though always schismatical, are not always nullities;" thus reserving, upon primitive precedent, to the Established communion the validity of its ministrations, but casting upon it an imputation, which we are more concerned to confess than to deny, of the sin of schism. This sin, on all intelligible catholic principles, attached to the established communion under the new primate Tillotson, and may, in its invisible workings, be visited at this moment on this generation; a sin of our forefathers, which their posterity are deeply concerned not to palliate but to confess and repent of.

These observations cannot but serve to convince us of the great interest which would attach to a life of Bishop Ken. We know and admire his dislike of controversy; we fully enter into his entire aversion to all casuistry; and we have no doubt but that it was a serious, and simple, and practical turn of mind, alike unwilling and unable to enter into the endless intricacies and subtleties of the whole question which agitated his brethren, that led him to disapprove of their measures, to resign his spiritual powers, and diocesan jurisdiction. These he ceded to his friend Bishop Hooper, as Bishop of Bath and Wells, on the death of the intruder Bishop Kidder, in 1703; and when, on the death of their head, Bishop Lloyd, in 1709, some of the most distinguished of the Non Jurors applied to him, he refused to challenge their obedience as a catholic Bishop, and to head their communion. We have been at some pains to prove, in a former number, that the state of the Church of England, at the time when he finally and formally resigned all claims, was most favourable to the conduct which he pursued at that juncture; that the sees were all filled, not with intruders, but with the successors of the intruders. If he could not distinctly satisfy himself as to Catholic *principle*, he did right to act on good precedents, if such might be found; at all events, in full compliance with that good and pure Christian *feeling*, or, so to say, *instinct*, which

so uniformly guided him ; and, of course, to act with that truly catholic temper which would forego all personal claims or interests.

Still, the assumption which is made in the salutary caution of the reviewer of Ken's works, in the *British Magazine*, to us of these latter days, to beware of "*division for nothing*," is very gratuitous. It is a strange thing to assume, that the distressing schism which, at that time, rent the Church, was "*division for nothing*," in any stage of it; or that the Non Jurors were the schismatics ; which this language might seem half to imply. It is but fair to the great and good men who took the other side, to affirm that they had many reasons to urge. It is true, that there were those who were clamorous ; and Bishop Ken, both at the time of his cession to Hooper, and on the occasion of his final cession, was assailed by some of them in a manner little becoming the good cause. A letter of some virulence is inserted by Mr. Round, as a note to one of those letters in which Ken complains to Bishop Lloyd of the treatment he experienced from his brother Non Jurors, on his cession to Bishop Hooper. Now, whatever may be thought of the tone of the letter, which is very interesting as bearing on the correspondence between Bishop Lloyd and Bishop Ken, now first published, it at least gives us some idea of the manifold difficulties in which the whole affair was involved. The knot, however, is too hard to be severed or disentangled by a letter which may have ever so much an air of unamiableness or intemperance, so long as points, so important as those which lie on the very face of it, remain unsettled or unexplained. It is evident, that Bishop Lloyd of Norwich, and Bishop Hicke, had some grounds for what they did ; and if the answers of Hicke, and a few more of the answers of Lloyd, could be discovered, we should gain a better insight than we have had hitherto into the characters of both parties. We wish, therefore, that Mr. Round had not only examined by these new documents, which are precisely of that nature where character is most naturally and incidentally discovered, that of Bishop Ken ; but also, in connection with them, had touched, as succinctly as the case would admit, the arguments on each side ; and that he had briefly analysed the matter, more particularly as it is illustrated by the known authority to which Ken almost implicitly defers, the "*Christian Communion*" of Kettlewell.

We are aware that this, again, would be a work of no small difficulty, and would require deep thought and research ; but we are so far from thinking that the division, whether *before or after Ken's resignation*, was necessarily *division for nothing*, that we can see ample grounds for reasoning on both sides, in the very positions on which Kettlewell has based his work. It would be,

nevertheless, a work of great interest; it would lead us into a close consideration of Ken's friendships and his feelings, his judgment of Kettlewell's character and writings, his intimacy with Lloyd, Turner, and Hickes, the active promoters, on the one hand, of the non juring succession, and with Dodwell and Nelson, on the other, the opposers of it, whose correspondence with Ken on the subject still remains to us, at least, in part.

This perhaps, it might have been well to have inserted in this edition of the prose works, as well as Ken's letter to Nelson on the publication of Kettlewell's works; which Mr. Round has also omitted. Our own impression, upon a less careful review of the subject than we could wish, is nearly this,—that, in the first place, Ken saw the necessity of entering his firm and resolute, though temperate, protest against the authority by which he was deprived, and to assert his right and jurisdiction as Bishop of Bath and Wells, notwithstanding his deprivation. This is evident from what we have seen he did immediately after the act took effect, and which we learn from one of the letters. In the next place, we think there is a very strong presumption that, upon the principles of the "Christian Communion," under the existing troubles which surrounded them, he would see also the necessity of the commission by which the deprived Metropolitan Sancroft at once asserted his metropolitical authority, and conveyed his power to Bishop Lloyd, as a means of continuing to the scattered flock, who came from all quarters to London, the blessings of Christian ministrations. He would see, nevertheless, how this would necessarily throw the Church, for a while, at least, as in a state of persecution, upon itself and its spiritual resources; that it would imply the risking the loss of all its secular advantages and convenient arrangements, its temporal privileges of establishment, nay, in this great emergency, of its very houses of worship, and even its district-jurisdictions, as non-essentials, in order to secure the essentials of catholic doctrine and catholic fellowship. The instrument by which this authority was conferred, was dated Fresingfield, February, 1691. Ken, therefore, professed himself ready fearlessly to maintain his diocesan right and jurisdiction, and to supply his own flock, over which the Holy Ghost had made him overseer, with holy ministrations; and he asserted this authority as long as Kidder lived, i. e. from 1690 to 1703. Again, under the emergency, he approved, no doubt, the formation of that communion which gave up the *particular jurisdiction*, and threw the Church of England on its *catholic basis*; which was in entire harmony with Kettlewell's views, and in which Kettlewell died. But here we think it evident he stopped. The consecrations which took place afterwards, to which we have alluded, of Bishops

Hickes and Wagstaffe, on the nomination of King James, in February 1693, he did not approve. In the year 1716, indeed, a posthumous collection of papers by Hickes, was published, in which it is plainly declared to be "untrue, that the consecrations of the bishops wanted Ken's consent; for that he had even given that consent in a letter which he had written on purpose to Bishop Turner, one of the consecrators; that he afterwards congratulated one of the bishops so consecrated, and declared himself to have been, though not present in body, yet present in spirit, at the consecration." On what authority this is stated, we know not. It is clear, from the letters now published, in particular from two, addressed to Dr. Hickes in the year 1700, as well as from those which he wrote to Dodwell and Nelson in 1709, that he "always opposed those clandestine consecrations;" that he foresaw they would perpetuate the schism which he daily deplored; that he thought these insidiously procured by Melford (the Earl of Melfort), who could intend no good to the Church; but that he was at last forced to tolerate what he could not approve." In the letters to Bishop Lloyd, he mentions, more than once, that he had "recommended the two last chapters of the Christian Communion to people's reading." The one, we suppose, "*On the excusableness of receiving ministerial offices from men in a schism, rather than living without any at all;*" the other, "*On communicating, in a like necessity, where there are Prayers sinful in the matter of them,*"—as most likely to prepare a way for the closing of the rupture. He claims his friend Turner, "now with God," as having the like thoughts, and as having given the like advice to a worthy person now near him in the country; and Bishop Lloyd himself, as not disagreeing with him.

On the whole, our impression is, that the maintainers of the succession maintained it on principles sound and tenable, according to canonical strictness; that they maintained catholic views, though often with too little regard to a charitable catholic spirit; and that Ken, in consideration of the miseries and scandals occasioned by the separation, the guilt of which, nevertheless, did not lie at the door of the Non Jurors, was induced, as matter of feeling, to resign. He believed the interests of the truth to be more at stake in the existing schism than they could be in closing it; he had entered his solemn protest, and was anxious still to guard it in every possible way; and, being unable to see his way through points of casuistry, the workings of which might be interminable, he conceived himself at liberty to dispense with canonical strictness; and, where he thought catholic principle and precedent less obvious than others thought it, he resigned, but not until he had found one in whose hands he thought the "deposi-

tnm" would be safe, nor till he had vindicated and guarded the spiritual functions of the Church.

We have gone more at length into this debate, because the whole matter has attracted a growing interest in these days; and nothing is more quoted, or quoted more irrelevantly, than the cession of Bishop Ken, and his opinion on the succession. We repeat, then, that he thought it his duty, at first, to assert even the *right of jurisdiction*; and afterwards, in case of trouble and perplexity, where it could not be maintained, the *necessity of preserving catholic communion without it*: and therefore his example cannot be urged in defence of any worldly views, of any political expediency which, at any time, may tempt us to waive the interests and privileges of the Church. We should be ready as he was, as prepared by discipline and self-denial to give up all temporal interests, and should be content, too, whenever such emergencies call for it, to have "*no ground, no, not so much as to set our foot on;*" but to live as members, not of an established but of a pilgrim society, not so much of a *national* as of *the one catholic and apostolic Church*. We must learn, as he did, "*the practice of Divine Love.*" We must become characters like Ken before we can understand and quote him as our example. We must be as fearless, and constant, and unworldly as he was, before we appeal to his acquiescence as an authority for our ourselves.

These matters form a prominent feature in the letters now published, and require full explanation. We know not how the Church question could have been touched otherwise than in a more enlarged preface—nor how Ken's character could be adequately understood without a new "*Life.*" The letters provide ample materials for both; they require, however, frequent illustration from sources which have been long hidden, but from which might be formed a most interesting history of one of the most painful but important periods in the annals of the Church of England.

The character, however, and the views of Ken, demand more attentive study, and the controversy in which he, or rather his name, has ever been so much concerned, a more temperate and impartial decision than it has hitherto met with.

Hawkins's short account might be made, what indeed it is, and ever must be, the basis of any full and authentic account of Ken. But it is a mere frame-work; and no one can read it, we should think, without feeling that there must be far more behind which he would wish to know, concerning the subject of that memoir. And the materials are ample;—the works of Ken are a commentary upon his life. In his sermon on Daniel, he has unconsciously drawn a vivid picture of himself, and anticipates as unconsciously,

with a most extraordinary foresight, the trials which awaited him. His sermon on Passion Sunday is a most beautiful statement of his Church views; his picture of "penitent, patient, reformed Judah," is a type of the Church of England; the deep humility, quietness "and confidence" of the one, a representation of what he always believed to be the spirit of the other—her "Doctrine of the Cross." His "Practice of Divine Love" is a beautiful specimen of what he believed to be her real temper, as shown in the Catechism, and of the character which a realization of the catechetical system of instruction, under God's blessing, must naturally tend to form. His "Directions for Prayer" carry on that good foundation by making the Catechism into prayer and praise, and thus identifying it with our spiritual life here, and leaving it to be more and more developed; till "the first and great commandment, to love the Lord our God with all our souls," taught us here, grows with our growth and strengthens with our strength, and so ripens into eternity. His Morning and Evening and Midnight Hymns, are a most natural description of the spirit in which he spent his days and nights; his Hymns for Saints' Days and Festivals, a proof of the even and perfect tenor of his Christian year. His "Anodynes" are a delightful exemplification of the calm and tranquil joy which he felt in the midst of most acute pain and suffering. His "Preparations for Death" are a striking commentary on the fact related of him, that he always travelled with his shroud. His works, in every part, disclose a constant struggle to realize life and immortality, and a constant and habitual converse with the invisible world. It may at first be thought by the readers of his poems, that there is a tameness, and sometimes a want of taste, inconsistent with the singular and characteristic beauty of his prose works. We can see, in the names introduced, and in the structure and diction, peculiarities which Mr. Bowles has attributed, perhaps rightly, to a study and imitation of Cowley's "Davideis," but we cannot but perceive in them all a reality which at first sight does not strike us, but which grows upon us more and more. The way in which the firm and comfortable belief of the guardian angels, who, by God's appointment, "succour and defend us," both when we wake and when we sleep, is interwoven with his very existence, is most remarkable. The Hymns crown what the "Practice of Divine Love" begins; we see a soul gradually ripening for heaven, literally growing up into everlasting life.

"Till oft converse with heavenly habitant
Begin to cast a beam on th' outward shape,
The unpolluted temple of the mind;
And turn it, by degrees, to the soul's essence,
Till all be made immortal."

We see, in every part of Ken's hymns, a commentary upon the fact mentioned by Mr. Bowles, that his Greek Testament opens of itself to this day, at the 15th chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians, an earnest of that great change from life to immortality, for which he lived in habitual preparation, a foretaste of the presence of the Almighty, under whose shadow he dwelt here, and in whose light he hoped to see everlasting light. We shall thus see here ample reason for being cautious and reserved on the character of Ken. We cannot sympathize with the man who could speak of his works with flippancy, or of any part of his conduct with contempt or pity. We can see reasons, also, for being jealous of allowing people to point out any frailties in a character so pure, or for admitting any works to be his which may be inconsistent with the spirit we have been describing.

We see, then, the duty of comparing his works and the known acts of his life together, and tracing what we are sure will be found their entire harmony and identity; and also the necessity of sifting carefully the testimonies, if any, on which spurious works have been admitted to be Ken's, and examining how far certain of his alleged words or works are at variance with such a spirit.

Indeed, the general idea of Ken, which the only authentic account of his life, and our inference from his various works, compared with it, conspire to set before us, is so pure and exalted, his devotion so deep and unfeigned, his self-denial and patience so uniform and unwearied, and his love of seclusion, and unobtrusive temper so undoubted, that we should be unwilling to recognize any feature which is not in full harmony with these characteristics. And again, his writings are so natural and eloquent, and so true a picture of his mind, that we should be most reluctant to admit the genuineness of any works where this naturalness, and an eloquence so peculiar that it is not easy to mistake it, should be wanting.

On these grounds, and in the absence of all external testimony, we are disposed to agree with Mr. Round, in excluding as spurious, two works, I. "The Royal Sufferer, a Manual of Meditations and Devotions, written for the use of a royal though afflicted Family," by T. K., D.D. 1699; and II. "Expostulatoria, or the Complaints of the Church of England against 1. Undue Ordinations—2. Loose Profaneness—3. Unconscionable Simony—4. Encroaching Pluralities—5. Careless Non-residence."

These books are both lying before us as we write; "The Royal Sufferer," without the name of the printer, or the place where it was printed, but with a worn impression of Vertue's fine engraving of Ken, usually prefixed to his life and poetical works; and the "Expostulatoria," with a preface professing to give a sketch of Ken's

life, with every date wrong, claiming him as the author of the work, which is owned to have been written some years before the date of this publication, 1711; but supposing, moreover, that "the spirit of devotion which shines through the whole, will convince the reader acquainted with Ken's composures, that he is the incomparable author." Besides this preface, there is prefixed Dryden's "Character of a good Parson," in which the preface tells us that Mr. Dryden has very accurately drawn his picture of Bishop Ken. This character is one of the most beautiful of Dryden's imitations of Chaucer. What right these works have to these vivid representations respectively of the painter and the poet, we know not. Certain it is that the engraving by Vertue, if it is prefixed to other editions as well as to that before us, (and we know of but one between the years 1699 and 1723,) could not have found a place there before the year 1713, when the first impression of Vertue's two engravings was placed as the frontispiece to Hawkins's "Short Account." This was two years subsequent to the death of Ken. And it is equally certain that Dryden's "Character of a good Parson," which appears to have been written in 1697, could not have been affixed to either of the previous editions of the "Expostulatoria," which, under the different names of "Ichabod" and "Lacrymæ Ecclesiarum," bear date respectively 1663 and 1691.

As far as the former of the two works is concerned, Ken, who is represented by his biographer as having suffered the unfair treatment, of having spurious works attributed to him in his lifetime, either might not have known, or might not have thought it worth while to disown a work, which bearing only the initials "T. K.," notwithstanding the work speaks of the author as one of the Seven Bishops, he had no need so far to appropriate to himself, and take upon him seriously to disclaim it.

As to the latter of the two works in question, it was not, so far as appears, attributed to Bishop Ken, during his lifetime, but was published anonymously. And when it was openly published under his name, the writer of the preface above alluded to speaks of it in rather a prevaricating way, "not as levelled at the present miscarriages of the Church, but rather *written* some years since." This he gives as "his *sentiments*." Now the writer either had it in *manuscript* or he had not. If he had, he need not have spoken of his *sentiments*, he would have been tolerably well informed of its age. If, as we suspect was the case, he had it not in manuscript, but in the form of a loose pamphlet, which had become scarce and was little known, thinking it to be "applicable," as he says, "from the melancholy truths in it, to the times," he fixed the name of Bishop Ken to the title page, who was just then dead, fresh in the memory of all, a name from whom, upon

such expostulations, would derive weight, and to whose prose writings, it must be confessed, many parts bear considerable similarity.

Bishop Ken died in March, 1710. The copy of the "Expostulatoria" before us was published in 1711; and the disclaimer of the work in the "Post-boy" quoted by Mr. Round bears date April, 1711. There is precisely that view contained in it which one might fancy a young person might describe, who saw vividly the contrast between the theory and the practice of the Church. If Ken wrote it, it must have been when he was yet fellow of New College, since the "Ichabod" came out in 1668, in the twenty-sixth year of his age. It was printed, however, at Cambridge; which strengthens the arguments against it. When it was published expressly under his name, Ken was no longer alive to disclaim it. And we can only regret that Hawkins, who wrote the life and published the Poems so soon after, and who could scarcely have been ignorant of the fact, should not specifically have disclaimed works thus definitely attributed to the bishop. As it is, the authority of Ken's executor is merely negative. The "Expostulatoria" is more like his writing than the "Royal Sufferer." The former is such as we might suppose his writing to have been in his earlier years. The likeness of the latter to Ken's writing we do not think Mr. Round has accounted for sufficiently by calling the points of resemblance, characteristics of the writers of those times. There is a want of that sweetness and natural resignation, that habitual thankfulness and fulness of heart, which is so remarkable in Ken's works. We should say it is like a designed imitation of Ken in many parts, but, as such imitation must be, ill-sustained. We are indebted to the publisher of this work for pointing out Ken as the original from which Dryden filled up his characteristics of a Good Parson. Scott, in the note prefixed to this piece, in his edition of Dryden, has indeed this remark. "With a freedom which he (Dryden) frequently used elsewhere, he has added the last forty lines; in which, availing himself of the revolution which in Chaucer's time placed Henry IV. on the throne, he represents the principles of his priest as the same with those of the non-juring clergy of his own day. Indeed the whole piece is greatly enlarged on Chaucer's sketch." Mr. Bowles has pointed out the passages. There could be but one of that non-juring party to whom they could apply,—that one who was to Scott, perhaps, as he has been to many others, in great measure, unknown; and whom the publisher of the Expostulatoria has identified in lines which do not describe a class, but distinguish an individual.

" A parish priest was of the pilgrim train,
An awful, reverend, and religious man.
His eyes diffused a venerable grace,
And charity itself was in his face.
Rich was his soul tho' his attire was poor,
(As God had cloth'd His own ambassador),
For such on earth his bless'd Redeemer bore.
Of sixty years he seem'd, and well might last
To sixty more, but that he liv'd too fast.
Refin'd himself to soul to curb the sense,
And made almost a sin of abstinence.
Yet had his aspect nothing of severe,
But such a face as promis'd him sincere.
Nothing reserv'd or sullen was to see,
But sweet regards, and pleasing sanctity.
Mild was his accent, and his action free.
With eloquence innate his tongue was arm'd,
Tho' harsh the precept, yet the preacher charm'd ;
For, letting down the golden chain from high,
He drew his audience upwards to the sky ;
And oft with holy hymns he charm'd their ears,
A music more melodious than the spheres.
For David left him when he went to rest
His lyre, and after him he sung the best.
He bore his great commission in his look,
But sweetly temper'd awe, and softened all he spoke."

We shall be pardoned for quoting these lines, which certainly have to us had a new aspect altogether since we have connected them with Bishop Ken. The allusion in the Revolution is equally striking.

" ——— when Richard was depos'd,
And high and low with happy Harry clos'd,
This prince, tho' great in arms, the priest withstood,
Near tho' he was, yet not the next in blood."

And Ken's subsequent conduct, his retired habit, and silent thoughtfulness.

" He join'd not in their choice, because he knew
Worse might, and often did, from change ensue.
Much to himself he thought, but little spoke,
And undepriv'd his benefice forsook ;
Now through the land his cure of souls he stretch'd,
And like a primitive apostle preach'd,
Still cheerful, ever constant to his call,
By many follow'd, lov'd by most, admir'd by all,
With what he begg'd his brethren he reliev'd,
And gave the charities himself receiv'd."

These points are still more strongly illustrated by the letters now published; by Ken's charitable aid again and again rendered to his friend Dr. Thomas Smith, the ejected fellow of Magdalen College; and by the glowing piety which we can now see more perfectly in this valuable collection of his prose writings, in which, as Dryden truly concludes,

"He shines by his own proper light."

There is more, no doubt, which might be said on these two works, which would in parts admit a careful comparison with parts of his genuine works. We repeat our opinion, so far as it goes, that Mr. Round has rightly omitted them from the acknowledged writings. And we would not wish to have seen them admitted otherwise than as *doubtful*, and in a *different* type. Of the spuriousness of the "Retired Christian" we suppose there is no doubt. But we probably shall surprise those who have been more or less interested in this subject by an opinion which we do not venture to express without a good deal of thought, and in which we are most willing to be set right. We cannot, on the whole, so readily agree with Mr. Round in dismissing without more investigation the "Letter to Archbishop Tenison on his Funeral Sermon on Queen Mary," which he has unhesitatingly rejected as spurious, and which Mr. Bowles concludes from Burnet's silence could not have proceeded from Ken's high and honourable mind, "though he had no reason to be grateful."

In the first place, we suppose it came out at first in Ken's name. The copy which we have seen has unfortunately lost its title page; but wherever we see it spoken of, as in Rapin's History, and in the Biographia Britannica, we find it unequivocally spoken of as his. It is strange, however, that under the article Ken, which has been compiled with great care, there is no allusion to it whatever; whilst the sermon on Ascension Day, which certainly never was printed, but only carped at by a Romanist who went to Bath Abbey to hear it, and published his reflections, is mentioned amongst his works. It is strange also that the "Retired Christian" is the only work specifically disclaimed as spurious. However the delicate nature of the subject itself, and the connection of Ken with the royal household some years before, would call for a distinct denial on the part of himself or his friends. It was open to the express disavowal of himself and his executor; perhaps it was met by that disavowal; but it would be to us a matter of great interest to inquire whether between the beginning of the year 1695, when it appeared, and the bishop's death, any information on this head is to be found.

Different people, indeed, read with different impressions; but

we do not ourselves so clearly see that "the temper and tone shown through the whole of it are sufficient to prove that it was not written by Ken." Nor do we understand it as Mr. Bowles has understood it, as "reviling the memory of his respected and buried mistress."

We introduced these last few observations on the excluded works with a sketch of the general idea we have of Ken's character, and expressed our full sense of the jealousy with which we should view any work attributed to him which should derogate from it. But it is matter of interesting inquiry, as bearing on other characters besides that before us, how far that Christian meekness for which he was so distinguished, and that glowing piety, are necessarily inconsistent with that quickness of feeling and honest indignation, which Bishop Butler rightly defines in his sermon on Resentment, as "that passion from whence men take occasion to run into the dreadful vices of malice and revenge, but which even itself, as implanted in our nature by God, is not only innocent, but a generous movement of the mind; as in itself and its original no more than indignation against what is wrong." With all his softness, there is undoubtedly in Ken greater strength than some might suppose; with all his amiableness and self-discipline, there is an unflinching Christian boldness. No one can help seeing that charity is his very life, but based as it was on the love of God, it must be, ἀγάπὴ ἀνυπόκριτος, "love without dissimulation," in any sense. We believe this to be intimately connected with that entire love of truth, that uniform simplicity and sincerity, and plain dealing, which is visible in every act of his life, in his expostulations with the great, in his correspondence, especially with Bishop Burnet, and his answers at the "Examination before the Privy Council" appended to his "Life." We are aware we are treading on delicate ground, and we are so unwilling to let any one run away with the notion that this is an infirmity in Ken, that we ask those who may be interested in the matter, taking Ken's known character into the account, and the two documents we have alluded to, to read the letter; and we cannot believe that their impression will be so unfavourable as it seems to have been. The truth we believe is this. Mary's character has been known to us by unkind and fulsome flatteries. The Revolution has been looked upon in a mere political light. But to one who looked on things, as Ken did, in their realities, whose tie had been so close and confidential, and who felt how all domestic ties were broken by the political expediences of the day; who knew that the daughter was lost in the queen, and that the sister was unforgiven, there was much to feel and to say. It is sad that royal death-beds should have been thus brought for-

ward ; but when we compare the conduct of Tenison here with Ken's plain dealing with Charles II. ; when we see, moreover, throughout, so far from any reviling of his royal mistress, a most anxious and affectionate feeling on her behalf ; real and heartfelt pity, not blame ; we seem bound to read with a pastoral not a political eye, what Ken may have written as an early and faithful adviser of his mistress, whom he never failed to pray for, from the moment he heard of her sickness.

We may, perhaps, be able at some future opportunity to enter more fully on the works, and to touch many points which we have left untouched, but we should at least read with candour what is capable, we cannot but think, whoever be the author, of a favourable interpretation, and what was once thought less harshly of.



ART. VIII.—*Random Recollections of Exeter Hall in 1834—1837.* By one of the Protestant Party. London : Nisbet. 1838.

RELIGION is a social principle ; it cannot exist without fellow-feeling, nor can fellow-feeling be maintained without assemblies and celebrations. It is very well to maintain its more private and personal nature in a treatise for the closet or a discussion to serve a purpose ; but the notion of strictly independent, secret, isolated religion is unreal and theoretical. He who believes in a Maker and Governor believes that he is Maker and Governor of others besides himself ; and (if we may so parallel the sacred text) he who regards Him who made, regards them also who are made by Him. And, moreover, in a world of sin, the current of which runs strongly against the voice of conscience, and the high but delicate instincts of truth and purity, human nature, conscious of its weakness, will ever, in mere self-defence, look out for sympathy and co-operation in its arduous duty of maintaining what is unseen against what is seen.

When then men talk of religion being a secret thing between each man and his Maker, as being too sacred for co-operation, and too peculiar and individual for sympathy, they are either letting their words outrun their ideas or they are mere sceptics and men of the world, catching at any excuse which offers and promises well, in order to get rid of a subject they do not like. Men who are well content with things visible, and wish to frame the materials which this world supplies into a perfect system, who have their *summum bonum* upon earth, and who feel that it is attainable by means which are of earth, consider the religious

principle as nothing more or less than a principle of disorder, as the cause of infinite disarrangements and perplexities in that view and method of life which they would fain pursue ; and the religious element in our nature as a troublesome and vexatious phenomenon, which they cannot deny to exist, and to require satisfying, though they console themselves by a plain denial of its being a primary or essential part of our nature, or more than the result of education and association, and accordingly do their best to bribe it into quietness as cheaply and as expeditiously as they can.

Such is the case with those who deny that religion is a social principle, because they wish it expelled from society ; but others, and the mass of persons, who deny it, deny it in theory only, for party reasons, from bad education, or from other unsatisfactory causes ; and they convict themselves of inconsistency, and show that they are using words for ideas, by forthwith proceeding to act against their own doctrine. They resolutely maintain that each individual man must be ultimately dependent for his religious opinions on himself ; and yet in spite of this, by societies, and meetings, and tracts, and united movements, and celebrations, they do bring to bear upon him an extrinsic and external influence, an authority distinct from the sacred volume and from his personal and private inquiry into it, and calculated to overawe and to over-persuade him. They set up a power, the same in kind as the visible Church, to impress and seduce his imagination, in advance or in prejudice of his reason. In theory they maintain the right of private judgment, and the supremacy of Scripture without note or comment ; yet by all the enthusiasm of social feeling and all the excitement of a struggle, by those means which the Church uses openly and avowedly, they strive, without avowing them, to oppose them when avowed, to oppose them in the Church.

Even a system (of external *worship* we cannot call it, but) of ceremony and circumstance, is in course of formation, as the shell of testaceous animals, being at once the development and protection of that New Religion, which it has been the fashion among us of late years to substitute for the Ancient Faith. By the ancient religion we mean that which Popery corrupted ; by the new religion we mean that which Luther founded in his new definition of faith, and his new dogma, that justification by faith only is the one fundamental truth of the Gospel. The old religion had its pageants, rites, and festivals ; and the spirit of destruction which has been unchained in these last centuries declared that such observances were heathenish and idolatrous. The old religion had, or rather it has, its discipline, its monuments, and its ritual, as (by a good Providence) they are still preserved to us ; and these

were, or rather still are, represented by its enemies as unlawful persuasives, yokes, beggarly elements, instruments of bondage, or rags for the vanity fair of the great Babel. It had its solemn services; and what were these forsooth but mummeries, the fruit of idle legends, of pious frauds, representations *ad captandum*, evil doings that good might come, or exaggerations of what was true, or occasions of unduly exalting individuals, some poor, frail, and fallible being, who after all was but a man of like passions with the rest? It had its religious societies; and what were these but unscriptural, because not prescribed in Scripture? It had its convocations of clergy; and how could a hundred heads be infallible when laid together, when each separately was not so? It had its processions and litanies, and what were these but accurate and deliberate copies of Pagan customs? The most virtuous feelings were displayed, and the most touching delicacy, and the most jealous indignation at religion, which is a thing of the heart, being made so outward, so unspiritual, so unchristian.

It is said that nature will always revenge herself when outraged, and what is true of nature in the general holds good also as regards her religious workings. This pseudo-evangelicism, which is so alarmed at undue influences and yokes of bondage, is now acting over again, only with new dresses, what in many times and places it has already performed since Calvin set up his platform at Geneva. After destroying forms it is introducing others, which bear the same relation to the true ones as the tyranny of a usurper to the legitimate authority of the dethroned monarch. Well, indeed, were it for this king of the barricades if it could assume the venerable character of a father and judge; but, as was to be expected, being set up in rebellion, it has no where been able to preserve reverence, and for no long while to maintain even order. And at the present day, and among ourselves, it presents perhaps the most singular aspect which it has yet shown, and to which the small volume we have prefixed to these remarks will enable us to direct attention. While it still retained in its bosom some of its mother's warmth and its mother's fear, there was a sort of solemnity and seriousness in its movements. The Puritans were not triflers, nor the Covenanters cowards; but now, in a time of prosperity, when there is little to season our faith, and of scepticism, when there is much to sap it, while it professes more than ever the pomp of externals, and the impressiveness of combination, yet (most remarkable it is) it has stripped these instruments of influence, almost altogether of their sacred character, aims at religious objects by means which do not even pretend to religion, offers to God "the sacrifice of fools," and pleads for Him in the garb of the world.

The old religion thinks it scorn to appear before men except as God's minister. Its outward forms are but the type of what it is within. Within it is calm and serene, as the sea spread before the throne of God, reflecting in its bosom the stars of heaven and giving to view "the jewels of the great deep" which lie beneath. And such as this is the garb which, at its Master's command, it has put on from the beginning. Though its coat was of many colours, yet it was woven from the top throughout; though made with much cunning work and many a curious device, yet it was "fine linen, clean and white," like the inward "righteousness of saints." Such was the sanctity, the comeliness, the gravity of those ancient forms, which as being imbued with what they represented resembled it, and while they resembled it promised it. The order of the ministry, the descent and relationship of the churches, the ritual of worship, the precepts for governing, evangelizing, protesting, suffering, all spoke of that inward heaven which exists in its degree in the soul of every true Christian, and has its perfect unapproachable prototype in that of his Divine Master. What Christians were in private in the beauty of holiness, such were they when they met together in one, each member knowing his own place, as each faculty of his soul its own function. In the religious man, reason, will, conscience, affections, and passions do not struggle together, or settle in some compromise or "social compact" one with another; but each recognizes and takes what is its own by nature. And, in like manner, if we would see what true social religion is, we must betake ourselves to the various forms in which it is presented to us in antiquity, and not the least to that form which was the most formal and august of all, and the type of all in their several degrees, its synodal meetings. We shall betake ourselves, for instance, to Eusebius, and there read the account of the great Nicene Council: how the Emperor of the World provided for the Bishops a great hall in his palace, in the capital of Bithynia, where above 300, from all parts of the world, assembled at his charge; how they seated themselves each in his place in silence, waiting his arrival, and how, when he entered robed in his imperial purple, he gravely stood in the middle of the fathers till they called on him to take his seat. Or we may consult the following formulary for the opening of a Spanish council, which Mr. Keble has lately printed from Hardouin.

"At the first hour of the day, before sunrise," says this document, "let all be cast out of the Church, and the entrances being barred, let all the door-keepers stand at the one door, through which the prelates are to enter. And let all the bishops assembling go in together, and take their seats according to the time of their consecration. When all the bishops

have come in and taken their places, next let those presbyters be summoned whose admission the nature of the case in hand seems to warrant; and let no deacon intrude himself among them. After these may be admitted the more eminent among the deacons, whose presence is required by the regular form of proceeding. And a circle being made of the bishops' seats, let the presbyters sit down behind them; those, namely, whom the metropolitan has selected to be his assessors, such of course as may act with him both in judging and pronouncing sentence. Let the deacons stand in sight of the bishops; then let the laity also enter, who, by choice of the council, have obtained the privilege of being there. Moreover, the notaries must also come in, as is directed by the regular form, for reading documents and taking notes. Then, the doors being fastened, and the prelates sitting in long silence, and lifting up their whole heart to the Lord, the archdeacon shall say,—‘Pray ye!’ and presently they shall all fall on their faces to the earth, as well the bishops as the presbyters: and they, *continuing long in silent prayer, with weepings and moanings*, one of the *elder* bishops shall arise, and pronounce a supplication aloud unto the Lord, they all lying still on the ground The supplication being ended, and all having answered ‘Amen,’ the archdeacon says, ‘Stand ye up.’ Immediately let all arise, and *with all fear of God and orderly discipline*, let bishops and presbyters both take their seats. And thus, all in their places, sitting silently, a deacon, *wearing the albe*, bringing forward in the midst the Book of the Canons, reads aloud the chapter on the manner of holding councils And the extract from the Canons being ended, the metropolitan bishop shall address the council with an exhortation.”—*Keble. Postscript to Serm. on Trad.* p. 86.

Or if we would see how matters were conducted in the very rudiments of the Church, we may read in the book of Acts how “the *apostles* and *elders*,” the bishops and priests, “came together to consider of” a matter in dispute, and “the *multitude*” or laity “*kept silence*,” “*giving audience*” to their superiors in the Church; till after discussion ended, the presiding apostle summed up and gave judgment, and then all together, bishops, clergy, and laity drew up a declaration founded upon it. These are different forms of one and the same orderly discipline, types of one and the same inward harmony; of what St. Paul calls the Church’s “order and steadfastness of faith.” On the other hand, if we would know what kind of proceeding was *not* Christian, we shall find it in Tertullian’s well known description of the heretical assemblies, which will stand as a specimen of many besides it, which the early writers contain. “They are destitute,” he says, “of gravity, of reverence, of rule, *so as to correspond with their creed*. First, who is catechumen, who believes, does not appear; one and all are admitted, one and all hear, one and all pray; nay, though the heathen were to come in, they would cast their holy things to dogs, and their pearls, their false pearls, to swine. This

break up of discipline they call simplicity; our care of it they call corruption. Moreover, they are friends with all persons promiscuously; no matter what their private differences, so that they can combine together against the One Faith. They all are pompous, all consider themselves enlightened. Their catechumens are perfect first, and taught afterwards."—*De Præsc. fin.*

Such is the difference between the outward forms of truth and falsehood in the high and public functions of teaching and propagating the faith; and what it is on the largest scale, such is it in all, however reduced, wherever there is combination for religious ends. If, on the other hand, we would know what it is in private and individual duties, we shall detect truth by the same marks of simplicity, sobriety, staidness, and sanctity. What the ceremonial of a synod is to a body of Christians, such is the ceremonial of prayer, fasting, and almsgiving, as the most Sacred Authority enjoins them, to the private Christian; such is the vision of charity and humility as developed and typified in the Apostle's instances of "attending on strangers," "washing the saints' feet," and "relieving the afflicted;"—duties all of them of a severe and grave character, bearing upon them the impress of the inward principle from which they spring. And of a like solemn nature have hitherto been the outward forms of every popular religion, true and false; they have been *religious* forms. Far different is the religion which has become popular in this day. It is its peculiarity, that, though professing to be very high and warm and influential, it acts by instruments which do not even affect seriousness or reverence. For washing the saints' feet it has substituted charity bazaars, and for synods it has its May meetings; so that it is scarcely too much to say, that as former ages of the Church have been called, one the gnostic age, another the scholastic, another the synodal, this, in like manner, has earned the title of the *sæculum jocularæ*.

One phenomenon, indeed, is found amid the Ultra-Protestantism of this day, which certainly has a deep and earnest character; but has not yet made way in the body of the English community—and may it never!—We allude to the observance, habit, occurrence, or by whatever more suitable name it is to be called, of Revivals, as they exist on the other side the Atlantic. Something, indeed, of the kind seems to flourish among the Wesleyans in some parts of this country; but their proper field has hitherto been North America,—in those vast regions where the Church is not, or sits in feebleness as a stranger or outcast, where a Christian people are like sheep without a shepherd, and where Christian life is a fever, an ague, or a spasm, barely sustaining itself by such intermittent and convulsive throes, which, in a state

of healthy action, are but a disarrangement, not an exercise of its functions. Long, indeed, may such dreary and miserable exhibitions be confined to the "dry places" in which they originated, the solitudes of heresy and sectarianism; and speedy, so be it! may the deliverance of the poor captives be from the iron yoke which their forefathers have forged for them, instead of the "light burden" of the Church Catholic. But still, after all, such manifestations are of a religious nature; they correspond to the object from which they profess to arise; they speak about serious things in a serious tone; they carry upon them marks of enthusiasm, moral power, nay, and sometimes issue in permanent fruits. They cannot raise a smile; they excite respect, fear, sorrow, compassion. Far removed, as they are, from the sweet and equable calmness of the Church, yet they are an approximation to her temper, so far as this, that they indicate earnestness. Such then is the most favourable specimen at this day, under which, what may be called the ceremonial of the New Religion presents itself, as seen in America; but here, while it cannot dispense with forms and festivals, any more than across the water, one need not look very far to be convinced that its principle, as it exists, is not deep enough to be dark, nor vehement enough to be troubled, nor real enough to be violent. It has not life enough in it to give birth to deeds of the same nature as its professions. While in America it has developed itself in the hideous reality of revivals, it supports an artificial existence here on such expedients as have been mentioned, upon the mirthful, brilliant, and varied paraphernalia of charity bazaars and May meetings.

Now here we must make ourselves clearly understood, lest we convey an impression which we do not mean. When we condemn these instruments of religious undertakings, we have no intention whatever of implying any thing disrespectful towards this or that individual who engages in them, whether as provider or purchaser, speaker or listener. If, indeed, such things are evil, as we verily believe them to be, evil of course there must exist some where or other, in those who take part in them, whithersoever we shift or however we divide the blame; but there are very many at all times, perhaps the majority, who take those forms of religious operations which they find at hand, as the means of their own exertions, and have no time, no opportunity, no taste for inquiring whether these are the best possible, or intrinsically defensible. The most venerated names have before now appeared on the platform of religious societies; the kindest hearts have worked for bazaars; the most innocent curiosity, and the most guileless zeal have listened to the speeches which Scotch or Irish talent circulates through the country. We feel all this most fully; and should

be sorry to seem to feel otherwise; and yet we maintain that, although there be some who, as they did not cause, so are not hurt by the evil they take part in, still in the majority this hearing, speaking, buying, and vending, either originates or results, more or less, in that lower and less religious state of mind which is the soul of the system itself.

Dropping then individuals, and looking simply at the system, which they support, we see in this day this remarkable fact, that the New Religion, while it has recourse to externals, shrinks from religious externals. Much might be said in illustration from the case of charity bazaars, did our present subject lead us to consider it. Certainly it infuses sad suspicion that such methods of raising money are an evidence of the decay of genuine piety. What have the elegant nothings displayed on such an occasion to do with contributions for the serious matters of Church building or supporting hospitals? What do they intimate, when rightly interpreted, but this,—that bare charity or piety is too austere and imperative for men of this generation; and that Christians will not submit now to be beguiled of their alms or offerings, except by sweetening an unpalatable duty? Were they, indeed, but *additional* to large sacrifices freely made on the altar of Christian love, they might be taken as specimens how to convert *all* we do and are, even the elegancies of life, to the service of religion; but, being what they are, and working as they do, assuredly they are not a raising of the world to the Church, but a degradation of the Church to the world. And, moreover, were the subject before us, much might be said of the potent influence exerted on such occasions by the young ladies who oftentimes take their station at the booths and vend their charity. Aged bishops are said, of old time, to have exerted an arm of force, and to have compelled others to enjoy the privileges, and undertake the duties of the Christian Church;—but now-a-days, bright eyes and tasteful bonnets are found more effective, and, though we do not pretend to be connoisseurs in the matter ourselves, we certainly have read in the public prints that, whatever their advantage in the ball-room, our charming countrywomen never look so well as in a morning dress.

And, while the bazaar is the realm of feminine beauty, the platform is the region of manly eloquence, and still with the same object of propagating religion by means not religious. The societies which are there advocated are engaged always in benevolent, often in the most sacred and serious religious objects; this should be attentively considered. The Bible Society is formed for giving to individuals the sacred volume, which moreover it considers to be the one means of spiritual life. The Church Missionary Society is for the conversion of the heathen; the Jews, as its name

denotes, for that of the once chosen people; the Reformation Society for withstanding errors which their agents in their printed papers declare to be worse than paganism. Objects higher and more momentous cannot be conceived; and individual speakers confess that they are such, and treat them accordingly; and yet, on the whole, strange to say, the anniversary and other meetings, which are the most formal image of these societies, are essentially not religious. They *cannot* be made religious, for the attempt to make them so would be the signal for private judgment to insist through a thousand separate voices upon a thousand separate varieties of creed or form; and they *will* not be made religious, because their supporters hold that what inspires respect is a degradation of religion, a superstition and a mummery, and that forms are only safe when variable and secular. The temple of this new system is Exeter Hall; its holytide is "the London season;" its chancel is a platform; its cathedral throne is the chairman's seat; its ministers are the speakers; for holy salutations it uses "Ladies and Gentlemen;" for benedictions it has "cheers;" for a creed it maintains the utility of combination; and for holy services and godly discipline it proclaims civil and religious liberty throughout the world.

If we seem to have said more than the case warrants, we beg objectors to suspend their judgment till they have read the little book which has given occasion to our remarks, or at least such extracts as we are proceeding to lay before them. It consists of a series of lively and graphic descriptions of the leading speakers in Exeter Hall, for the sake of those who, not being resident in London, "have no opportunity," as it says, "of becoming acquainted with their manner, style, and appearance;" in the number of which occur names, which are little worthy of the notoriety it has given to them, and towards which men of the most opposite views must feel a reverence not to be destroyed even by Exeter Hall. At the same time we are bound to say that, except in one or two instances, there is nothing ill-natured in the author's pleasantry; he seems to have had no intention of doing more than drawing an entertaining sketch of what takes place in the great meetings of the religious world, and to have been most benevolently inclined to the actors in them whom he describes. If he is satirical, he cannot help it; it is the fault of his subject. Indeed, the tone of his volume, if we are right in estimating it, is a curious illustration of the point which we bring its contents to prove. He seems, that is, to have set about his task with a high notion of what he undertook to relate; but having not a grain of reverence for a system which is not calculated to impart any, and writing as people write, when they think they may make them-

selves at home with their subject, he has, without intending or fully knowing it, drifted off from seriousness to satire, and from praise to blame, leaving the reader quite at a loss how to draw the line between these opposites, or how far he means the one, how far the other. Ridicule certainly is not the test of truth; the most serious things may be made ridiculous. Exeter Hall and its religion would not be a joke merely because a lively pen had made them so. But when a professed admirer cannot help un-awares passing from panegyric to mockery, then the suspicion does fairly cross one, whether such a result is not the legitimate termination of the system, and the person instancing it is not merely following out the *reductio ad absurdum* which fairly attaches to it.

The author's own state of mind is most singularly illustrated by his Title-page, Dedication and Introduction. He calls his book "*Random Recollections of Exeter Hall, by one of the Protestant Party.*" Is this joke or earnest? Again, his Dedication is to "Mrs. —, one of the *best of women* and tenderest of mothers, these pages are inscribed as a token of filial love." This of course is most serious earnest; yet surely not of the most respectful kind. And again, he says he has "thrown together some recollections of several among the principal characters *who appear before the audiences of Exeter and Freemasons' Hall, or the Hanover-square Rooms;*" or in other words, we suppose, who "appear" on the London (religious) boards "before" overflowing houses. And he has been led to do so by a publication called "*Random Recollections of the House of Lords.*" The House of Lords is a most august assembly; but we never heard it claimed as a religious one; nor do we see that, if its members may be treated in a "random" way, that therefore the same treatment may be applied to those who take part in high religious matters, such as the propagation of Christianity and controversy with the Romanists.

With this introduction of the author let us first avail ourselves of his description of the large room of Exeter Hall itself.

"The large room of Exeter Hall was built to contain 4000 persons, with a splendid range of raised seats, to the left of the main entrance, a spacious area in front of it, and a platform, which of itself will accommodate 500 persons, to the right. At the back of the platform were formerly two sunk galleries, like the side-boxes of a theatre, which were opened or closed at pleasure, by means of moveable planks, which may be put aside during the progress of a meeting. They are now thrown completely open. The platform itself is elevated about six feet above the floor of the area, or central seats, and is finished in front by a handsome iron rail; the large and ornamental bars of which, placed about one foot from each other, are connected at top by a thick mahogany

spar. In the centre of its front row stands the chair, which in form much resembles that of King Edward the Confessor, in Westminster Abbey. It is of handsomely carved mahogany, with massy open elbows, and is cushioned, in the seat and back, with purple leather. Its dimensions are very large, and any gentleman of small, or even of moderate size, who may preside, can never be said to *fill* it. Very few chairmen appear to advantage there; some seem lost in it, others, at a loss how to occupy it, and where to sit in it, whether backwards or forwards, upright or lounging, to the right or to the left. Those who have seen it tenanted by Lord Winchelsea, will agree that few sit there with greater dignity, or appear more advantageously to themselves.

“To the right and left are common mahogany chairs for the speakers, and behind these are rows of high-backed benches, rising gradually above each other, and intersected by two flights of steps, which extend from the front row up to the entrances at the back. At upper corners are covered staircases, communicating with these entrances, the tops of which formerly joined the sunk galleries, and were often occupied by rows of ladies, more adventurous or less punctual than the rest. The platform is nominally appropriated to gentlemen, but the more curious sex seldom fail to get admittance there, in limited (or sometimes in large) numbers.”—pp. 7—9.

“When the room is quite filled, the finest view of it is from the deep recesses behind the platform. The scene visible from thence is truly magnificent. Below you lies the platform, slanting downwards, and, extending into a crescent shape, with its crowds, sitting or standing; beyond them is the large flat surface of the area, its close benches all filled, and the avenues among them occupied by chairs, or by persons who are fain to stand, for want of sitting-room. Behind this are the raised seats, gradually appearing one behind another, and equal to half the size of the whole room; all again fully crowded, and the descending steps among the benches filled by the standing multitude. Over their heads, the whole scene is crowned by the back gallery, at a height of many feet, behind the crimson draperies which extend among the pillars, and this is completely full also. Those who wish to realize the saying of “a sea of heads,” should take this view of Exeter Hall, on some popular occasion. When such an assembly rises, for prayer or praise, at the beginning or end of a meeting, the sight is still more stupendous; and the degree of sound they are able to produce, in the way of cheering or singing, is almost incredible. There have been occasions when that vast room has rung with the voices of those assembled within its walls; and a second peal of cheers succeeding, before the echoes of the first have died away, the noise altogether has been of a nature that few persons could bear unmoved.”—pp. 10, 11.

Under this, it seems, there is a second room for meetings, and the inconvenience resulting is thus described:—

“The plaudits of the upper and larger audience frequently drown the voices of those who are addressing the smaller one below; as they are situated immediately under the right side of the large Hall. Should the applause over-head not be very loud, it seems to arise from the lower

room, and many an inexperienced speaker has paused for his hearers to cease their cheers, when in reality the noise came from above, and had no reference to him whatever, but was addressed to some orator up stairs, perhaps expressing opinions diametrically opposed to his own."—p. 13.

A sketch of the Hanover-square Rooms, which follows, adds the effect of light and shade to the above descriptions.

"There is much of the private drawing-room style about it, which might keep a less polished auditory in good order; but the sex and station of those who fill the chief part of the place are so unfavourable to loud acclamations, or any noise whatever, that stranger-speakers are sometimes quite daunted at the silence in which they are heard; and mistaking the well-bred attention bestowed upon their addresses for indifference, they seem to long for the tumultuous approbation of Exeter Hall. A few friendly cheers on his rising and his concluding, a gently swelling murmur of applause, or a subdued laugh during his speech, are all that an orator at the Hanover Rooms must expect to call forth. I think I have never heard a hearty, noisy round of cheers bestowed there upon even the most popular favourites of the day, those who would elsewhere have been received with a deafening uproar of delight."—p. 14.

But, to return to Exeter Hall.

"The conformation of the Hall is not favourable to the larger class of human voices, and there are but few speakers who make themselves well heard throughout the room: the generality speak too low, or have too little power of lungs to be heard far beyond the centre of the area; while others, who almost deafen the sitters near them, are equally unintelligible to those at a distance, from the echo of the place itself. Thus the gentle speeches of Lords Cholmondely and Chichester, and the thundering oratory of Dr. Duff are nearly all alike pantomime to the occupants of the raised seats; though from diametrically opposite causes, for the Doctor speaks just as much too loud as their Lordships' voices are too low. Perhaps Lords Winchelsea and Roden, Captain W. Wellesley and Mr. J. E. Gordon, are four of the most universally audible speakers we have. Their voices, though widely differing from each other, are all loud, clear, and equal-toned, and may be well heard from an upper raised seat, or even from the gallery; while, in order to hear agreeably an address from Mr. John Hockin, I should prefer to be in one of the outer passages, or perhaps even in the Strand itself."—pp. 16—17.

The various feelings under which the audience are brought together are next described; and we insert the passage to show how much in earnest the author is on the whole, a fact which needs impressing again and again on the reader's mind, while he turns over the pages which follow.

"Perhaps the truth may be more accurately stated by saying, that although many among the hearers, especially the younger part of them, may be drawn together by the love of a holiday, a crowd, and some fine speaking, with a peep at public proceedings, yet numbers who attend the

anniversaries of our societies are attracted thither chiefly, if not solely, by a desire of information as to the progress of religious and moral truth, and the wish to improve their own zeal by kindling their torches from those of the most devoted servants or Missionaries of the Cross.

“Of these latter exemplary persons, it will not be too much to say, that though some of them, unknown to their hearers, and it may be, unknown to themselves, may cherish within them feelings of self-complacency, or a desire to shine in the public eye; yet the major part, whether noblemen, clergymen, or others, are simple-hearted, straightforward benevolent men, whose chief desire, in addressing public assemblies, as well as in the other actions of their lives, is to spread civilization and Christianity among their fellow-creatures, and to promote the worship and the glory of their God.”—pp. 19, 20.

The volume is divided into six chapters, in which are successively discussed “Noble Speakers,” “Clerical Speakers,” “Parliamentary Speakers,” “Naval and Military Speakers,” and “Various Lay Speakers;” among which are to be found, the Duke of Newcastle, Lords Cholmondely, Roden, Brougham and Ashley, Rev. Baptist Noel, Drs. Cooke and Croly, Rev. Messrs Wolff and Cunningham, Mc Ghee and O’Sullivan, Benson and Beamish, Mc Neile and Bickersteth. A short account is given of their person, manner, dress, attitude, voice, and style of speaking, and of any special occasion which has distinguished them for the better or the worse. The delineation is not only playful and good natured, but displays a good deal of nice discrimination, and is very little overcharged. Incidentally too it brings out the peculiarities of the place to which it relates; and is a most conclusive witness to two points concerning these meetings, which were antecedently to be expected; first, that their end and object as meetings, is not an act of thanks or praise where it is due, not a contemplation of religious subjects, not even the spread of information on religious subjects, but an exhibition of persons and oratory; and *through* this the advancement of such ulterior ends as have better claim to a religious parentage. Publicity and money are gained for the objects to which the respective societies are devoted on the consideration of a certain quantum of entertainment given or received,—on the terms of seeing a number of noble and other personages, and hearing a number of celebrated or eloquent speakers. And next, as was to be expected, it clearly appears that variety and novelty are principal conditions of these exhibitions, whether they be secured by the judicious admixture of Scotch and Irish eloquence, or of men of rank and men of name, or of old favourites and of strangers, and of native Englishmen and South Sea Islanders or Kamschatkans.

The author, as we have seen, is anxious to supply for those who do not live in London some portion of that treat, which none

but Londoners can fully obtain; and therefore serves up before his readers a number of distinguished persons from various professions and ranks of life. Men are hard to please; we suspect some will be angry that they are left out in the bill of fare; but we are quite sure there are others who will be disgusted at being inserted. However, it is the fashion of the day to sacrifice private property to what may be called the railroad system; and we at least who profess no acquaintance with Exeter Hall are gainers by our author's adoption of it. But for this volume we should not know that Lord Downshire's "eyes are blue with an expression of gravity, his nose long and somewhat sharp, but the greatest peculiarity of his countenance is a nervous twitch in its muscles when he speaks. It gives you the idea *that the right side of his face is jesting with one half of his audience, at the expense of the other*, upon the sentence he has just uttered."—p. 30. Nor would they know that Lord Roden's "gesture is energetic, sometimes vehement, and without much variety," consisting "chiefly of *a powerful wielding of the arm*."—p. 32; nor of Lord Winchelsea, that "the first remark you would make on seeing him is, '*How clean he looks*,' and the second, '*How honest!*'"—p. 37; nor that his action consists in "a short start back, an indignant stamp with the foot, and a repelling motion of the right arm, with a *most indescribable energetic shake of the whole person*."—p. 39; nor that while he declares the "zeal for the good cause which burns within his breast," "he bestows, at the same moment, *a far-fetched stroke, like that of a sledge hammer*, which would nearly destroy a less firmly built frame than that which receives it."—p. 40; nor that Lord Chichester's "hair is dark brown, long and bushy, as well as his whiskers, and as he often dresses in a suit of the same shade," he sometimes looks "as nearly as possible *all of one colour* from head to foot."—p. 42; while his speeches "are of that quiet, *pious* kind which are best described by the common saying, '*It is as good as a sermon to hear them*.'"—p. 43; nor that "a speech from Lord Mount Sandford is very much like what he often describes himself to have been in his youth, '*a harum-scarum chap*.'"—p. 54.

Equally interesting and not more reverent are his descriptions of reverend speakers. Of Mr. Baptist Noel he says, "Whatever be his subject, he always touches it with the same accomplished refinement. *I have heard him describe a meal on the hind leg of a kangaroo* with as much grace and dignity as he would have dwelt on the destiny of an empire."—p. 78. On the other hand, the Master of the Temple is said to be "the *coldest looking man* I ever saw; not cold in feeling but in bodily aspect. He seems as if he had been frozen up, and was endeavouring to regain his

vital warmth.”—p. 85. Again, we learn that Dr. Croly “is built in the Cyclopean style of architecture;” that his gait, movements, expressions, ideas, are all in the gigantic style; that there is something vast and mysterious about him; that “his countenance has a strange antique appearance, well according with the antediluvian kind of majesty which clothes his figure;” that he is like “a thoroughbred gentleman just come from the moon;” that “to comprise his general exterior in a few words, *he is very like a brother of the Three Fates from the Parthenon.*”—pp. 87—91. Dr. Croly is drawn not only as an orator on the platform but in the pulpit, where ordinarily “he stands nearly motionless, or, resting his hands on the sides of the pulpit, *he swings to and fro, with his head projected forward, almost in the manner of a Roman catapult on its side supports.*”—p. 89. Of Dr. Duff, of the Scotch Kirk, we are told that he is “the *brightest star* that has appeared in the month of May for some years. No single speaker attracted so much attention, nor *drew forth such perpetual plaudits* during the last season.”—p. 95.

The variety of these sketches is not their least merit, as we have prepared our readers to expect. Different from all the foregoing speakers is the celebrated Mr. Wolff. We are informed that “he is far from tall, and his person is very stout. His hair is of a deep red colour, very thick and long, often falling on his collar;” his complexion is very dark, his eyes small and twinkling, his English unintelligible to many ears, his utterance rapid, and his delivery in a shrill chanting tone.

“His action is wild and exuberant in the extreme: he frequently assumes a kind of dancing movement, holding up both his arms to their full extent, and shaking all his fingers; then he clasps his hands on his breast, and steps quickly backwards and forwards; then, perhaps, lays hold of some friend, whom, in the warmth of the moment, he almost embraces, immediately starting away with a loud exclamation, and renewing his dancing action.”—p. 102.

Mr. Stowell, of Manchester, presents a remarkable contrast with this singular man. “His face is large and broad;” “his eyes blue and laughing,” and “his mouth, which is very wide, *garnished with splendid white teeth.*” We are told that “his images are striking, sometimes rather coarse, and his style often the most jocular, *even to broad comic effect;*” that “no speaker more frequently *sets the Hall in a roar,*” and that it is a question “which makes the most noise in proportion, Mr. Stowell or his audience.”—pp. 112, 113. We are further told,

“Those who have heard Mr. Stowell will allow that no man is more completely calculated for popularity among mixed audiences. His zeal for the Established Church, his vehement Protestantism, his free,

strong mode of speaking, his loud voice, merry face, and humorous anecdotes, give him a perpetual untiring interest with them. He appears every year, and at almost every meeting, yet no man is a greater favourite; they are never wearied with applauding him, and always cheer him rapturously."—pp. 113. 114.

Other sketches are equally brilliant, as of "*that splendid binary star, M'Ghee-and-O'Sullivan*;" of Mr. Cumming, with a person "not exceeding five feet four or five," and a "complexion resembling *alabaster with a deep damask colour*;" of "good Mr. Seymour," who tosses his head up and down, when speaking, with such animation, that a young lady observed, that he looked "as if *he had been half scalped by the Indians*, and had forgotten to have it fastened down again;" of Sir Andrew Agnew, whose features express "*despair*," and who confesses "in a piteous tone" that he is "accounted the offscouring of all things;" of Sir Edward Parry, who "looks emphatically *a fine fellow*;" of Captain Gordon, whose voice is heard "distinctly above the tumult of two or three hundred men," and who "seems *as if he could out-roar a lion as easily as he would out-argue a Jesuit*;" and of Mr. Stewart, (whom no one can mention without regretting that he with other excellent men should appear in such mixed company,) who "has a way of rising on tiptoe, with his arms elevated above his head, which has a peculiar effect, especially with his long, slender figure, and in this position he moves very much as if he were going to take wing and fly away."—p. 124. But we must not allow ourselves to enlarge on these and other inviting topics, lest room should be wanting for two or three extracts at length, which will give a much more vivid idea of the state of the meetings and the impressions they create than any thing that has yet been said.

The first shall be "*one of the perpetual favorites* of our London audiences, the Rev. H. H. Beamish, Minister of Trinity Chapel, Conduit Street."

"His popularity as a speaker is indeed well merited, for his talents are as varied as they are delightful; and in the two opposite departments of the pathetic and the humorous he has but few superiors.

"In person he is about five feet nine or ten inches high, and stout, but not inelegant, with a handsome countenance and a very gentleman-like aspect. His hair is dark and thick, his complexion good, and his features well cut. He has dark blue eyes, full of the most vivid and various expression; I seldom see him without thinking of the poet's address to his country—

"Erin! the smile and the tear in thine eyes

Blend like the rainbow that hangs in thy skies.

"And not only is this the case with Mr. Beamish's own countenance, but he has an irresistible way of producing the same effect on yours.

His humour is so keen and natural, yet so refined, and his pathos so tenderly touching, that few speakers more frequently mingle 'the smile' with 'the tear' in the eyes of their hearers.

"He is always fluent and eloquent; his ideas are graceful, and his language appropriate, but his great *forte* lies in anecdote. He tells a story better than any one I know, (always excepting Dr. Cooke,) and he has at command an inexhaustible fund of them, Irish and English, tragic, comic and romantic.

"His voice is sweet and powerful, and his Hibernian accent is of the most polished order.

"He is, like most of his countrymen, what the old writers call 'a man of parts, that hath a subtle and a ready wit;' for he is never at a loss, cannot be taken by surprise, and cannot be put out of countenance. Twice only, in the innumerable speeches I have heard him make, have I ever seen him at all in perplexity, and one really enjoyed the sight, from its rarity.

"The first time was in a long self-defence, in which he laboured hard at a troublesome task, with but limited success; the second occasion was very amusing, for he got really set fast in the middle of an Irish love story. Simplicity is one of his characteristics; a compound feeling or action is not in his line, and he then had to set forth the attachment of a Protestant girl to a young Roman Catholic, in the light of a very pathetic affair, in which he wished us all to be deeply interested; and yet he had, at the same time, to keep up our horror of Popery itself; so that between compassion and blame, he got quite into a labyrinth, and hesitated considerably, a most unusual event.

"He saw also that his hearers were more amused at himself than distressed for his heroine, which a little annoyed him; though amidst his dilemma, he could scarcely help laughing. He persevered, however, till he got past the marriage of the ill-assorted pair, and then, as if to take his revenge upon us, he changed his style, and claiming an undeniable right to our sympathies, wound up one of the most tragic tales I ever heard, of persecution, misery, and madness, in his most harrowing manner.

"He is very fine in his style whenever he attempts it; but, perhaps, I may refer to his speeches at the Naval and Military Bible Meetings, as specimens of his most truly touching anecdotes; while his addresses at the various Irish anniversaries are equally good, as samples of drollery and real wit. I well remember, at a meeting in the west of England, when Mr. Beamish first came over as a speaker, the great amusement he excited by his definition of the word 'boys.' He was describing a visit he had paid to a mine or colliery, and speaking of the men employed there. 'So, when I saw the creatures all coming about us, I said, Now boys, sit down, and I'll tell ye something; for we call every thing *boys* in Ireland, old women and all, ye know.'

"Mr. Beamish, at his first settlement in London, had the Irish chaplainship of the West Street Chapel, St. Giles's, which belongs to the Irish Society; he had, indeed, relinquished his preferment at Kinsale, for the express purpose of preaching to his poor countrymen in their

dear native tongue. In 1832, however, he gave up the Irish preaching, in consequence of his declining health ; but why he has never resumed that interesting employment, since he has become so well capable of doing it with renewed strength, remains a mystery to most persons, notwithstanding the long self-exculpation before-mentioned. Some of his private friends declare themselves equally in the dark on this subject.

“ Mr. Beamish’s private character is amiable and delightful ; he is an accomplished scholar and musician, and I cannot but think that he must be a poet, though I never heard the fact stated.”—pp. 124—128.

As a suitable set-off to the above, we select the sketch of “ Mr. John Hockin, *more familiarly known as ‘ the Brummagem Blacksmith.’* ”

“ I have heard loud voices, powerful voices, nay, stentorian voices ; but none ever greeted my auditory nerves which could merit to be called more than *moderate* when contrasted with his. Even Captain William Wellesley’s speaking-trumpet of a voice will not stand a comparison with it. It has, moreover, this wonderful peculiarity, that the louder it is raised, the more distinct becomes its articulation. At the greatest distance every word is as perfect as though spoken into your ears.”—p. 178.

“ I had gone into the Hall in the beginning of the day, with a friend, who was anxious to see some expected speaker. We saw the Bishops of London and Chester, Lord Teignmouth, and others, but not the person we sought ; and as some inaudible gentleman was speaking, we soon departed, glad to escape the excessive crowd and want of air. We then passed some time in the Lower Hall, where another meeting was going on, and after an excellent speech from Mr. Beamish, we left the room to return home ; but we had scarcely reached the main cross-passage, when we became sensible of an extraordinary sound, as though some energetic proclamation were being made in our very ears. We stopped to listen, but could not determine whence the noise came. We only knew that we had never before heard a similar one. We went up stairs, thinking that something extraordinary was taking place in the first-floor gallery ; but we were astonished, on reaching that spot, to find the voice as far off as ever.

“ We now turned towards the Great Hall and found that it was a speech being delivered there, and of which we clearly heard some words, we being on the *outside* of its walls. Determined to examine into the phenomenon, and knowing that the best approaches were too full to be attempted, we ascended the upper stairs, and on entering at the top of the raised seats, we found that the immense volume of sound proceeded from a dark, active little man, who stood on the platform, haranguing the multitude in tones of living thunder ; bestowing, at the same time, by way of emphasis, such tremendous blows on the platform-rail with his clenched fist, as he had been wont to deal upon his anvil, in the way of his calling ; for it was indeed no other than John Hocking, the chain and anchor-smith, the reformed drunkard, and at that time the overwhelming *cheval de bataille* of the Temperance Society.

" We looked at each other, sat down, and listened.

" His language was plain and course, but not ungrammatical, and he continued to detail facts, and to put vehement interrogatories to his hearers, all at the same pitch of voice ; so that if we had remained on the outside, we need not have lost one word of what he said.

" Some of his narratives had a sufficient lack of refinement about them, and as others almost trenched on the confines of propriety, nothing could be more amusing than to watch the effect on those around him.

" The Bishop of Chester was in the chair, and while some looked up in amazement, and some looked down in a vain pretence of not hearing what the deaf must have heard, while some looked fatigued, and some looked annoyed, (amongst whom Lord Teignmouth's curly hair, uneasy look, and fidgeting movements were conspicuous,) the good Bishop, in the best possible spirit, laughed, nodded, and cheered, and evidently regarded the exhibition as quite *unique*, and admirable in its kind.

" Place the Bishop of Chester where you will, he always finds his proper level, and always keeps it ; he takes all in good part, and never loses either his temper or self-possession. I doubt, however, whether his Lordship's ears have ever forgotten Mr. John Hockin.

" I only wonder how he, and the other sitters of that platform, survived the infliction, without a permanent deafness.

" Such a Niagara of an orator I never before heard, nor do I desire ever to hear such another."—pp. 178—181.

A third picture shall be added in a third style :—

" The painter who wishes to embody on canvass the *beau ideal* of a British Admiral, should paint the picture of Sir James Hillyar. His delightful countenance has all the proverbial openness, good humour, and jollity of an English tar, besides a something peculiar to itself, which makes it a pleasure look at him.

" The happy benevolence of his round, bronzed face, and smiling blue eyes, is set off by the thick, venerable white hair, which grows in profusion about his open forehead ; and his manner has all the vivacity of seventeen, though I should guess his years to be probably seventy.

" He has only spoken once, I believe, on the London platforms, and that, as might be expected, was at a Naval and Military Bible Meeting, in Freemasons' Hall.

" His lively look, his familiar style of speaking, the strangely compounded materials of his speech, the irresistible ludicrousness of his comedy, and the deep pathos of his tragedy, will not soon be forgotten by those who heard him. The ladies, especially, doted on him ; they called him " a lovely old gentleman," and took, in the best possible humour, his pathetico-comic addresses to themselves, under the complimentary title of " you young petticoats there !"

" He ended his speech very abruptly, and as he returned to his seat, was informed that he had forgotten to name the resolution he had been requested to move. Back he came to the front of the platform, with an indescribable drollery of eye and voice, saying, " It may seem very odd, that a man so unwilling to make one speech, should come back to ye to

make another; but talking to the petticoats, I forgot my proper business; ah! that's always the way!" And he shook his head at the ladies, who laughed and blushed, and delighted in the old Admiral exceedingly.

"When Mr. Cumming came on, towards the close of the meeting, (for this was his Bannockburn day,) Sir James was in raptures with him, He sat just by him, and the vehemence with which he clapped his hands and applauded that eloquent address, was as great as if the young Scotchman had just captured a French ship of the line. When Cumming concluded, amid enthusiastic cheers from the assembly, he turned round to make his retreat and hide himself behind the chair; and in so doing he had to pass close to Sir James, who, raising his broad Neptunian hand, with a face that said in every feature, "Well done! my little hearty!" bestowed on Mr. Cumming's much-to-be-pitied shoulders, three such strokes of admiration as might be heard half way down the Hall."—pp. 154—156.

If we had not some confidence that the above extracts must interest our readers, we should be diffident about risking another; but, under the circumstances, we think just one more is allowable. It presents a striking subject for a tableau vivant or an H. B. At a district Visiting Meeting, Lord Chichester having to vote thanks to the chairman, Lord Cholmondeley, began to enlarge upon the benevolent exertions of the latter; the narrative proceeds:—

"Lord Cholmondeley's modesty was sadly shocked at hearing his own good deeds thus publicly set forth, and, blushing very considerably, he extended a hand to catch hold of his panegyrist, and stop any further commendations. But Lord Chichester, though looking full at the audience, contrived to see his friend's attempt, and resolved that his just tribute to retiring merit should not be interrupted; and he gently edged himself away sidelong, and pursued his eulogy. The *Praisee* stretched himself farther and farther, trying to seize the corner of his provoking friend's frock-coat, which hung, most temptingly, just beyond his reach; for the Praiser, with a face of the most innocent gravity, and as though quite unaware of the *Praisee's* efforts, kept softly stepping farther off, so as just to elude his grasp, while he continued his remarks as before. After stretching himself sideways, quite to his full length, and nearly losing his balance, Lord Cholmondeley gave up the attempt, and resigned himself to the more common-place expedient of covering his face with his hands.

"Lord Chichester concluded his speech, and then sat down, with a look that fully showed the drollery within. The Marquis rose immediately, half angry, half ashamed, and quite distressed; and disclaimed the praises bestowed on him in the humblest and most modest manner.

"Altogether it was a highly pleasing, as well as amusing scene, and those who witnessed it will not soon forget the dry, grave waggery of Lord Chichester, nor the mingled frown and laugh of the excellent Marquis."—pp. 44, 45.

Now we ask our readers whether the above passages have not abundantly proved the point for which they have been made. The religion of the day undeniably cannot propagate itself by religious means, but addresses itself to means which are not only independent, but even in violation of religion. The tawdry decorations, theatrical displays, and pseudo-mysteriousness of Romanism, at least carry with them a religious profession; but what is there of a religious character in exhibitions, which to a deaf person, or to one who was suddenly introduced to them without knowledge of the societies to which they belonged, taken at greatest advantage, would not differ at all, or scarcely, from those of any other meeting, political or other, which take place in the metropolis? Without making ridicule the test of truth, yet what is to be said when parties actually profess to be ridiculous and make fun of themselves? Though truth may be ridiculed, yet surely error alone plays the buffoon; and, with every wish to be cautious in what we say, we cannot help coming to the conclusion that, while Exeter Hall has throughout all its floors the dry rot of irreverence, some of its speakers are but stage players at best, and at worst actual drolls and merry andrews. Surely truth is not lacquied by Puck and Bottom, by flibberty gibbets, and goblin pages, abbots of unreason, and boy-bishops. It is too sacred a matter to be presented to the mind under any but sacred images, and in former ages none have ever done otherwise, but heretics or the lowest rabble. We will not draw the conclusion which seems to follow, but submit with every serious, and we will add kindly feeling, the above reflections to the frequenters or patrons of the meetings to which they relate. Voices "out-roaring a lion," language "jocular even to broad comic effect," "the hall in a roar," "dancing movements," "wild gesticulations," "fashionable English costume," "agreeable gentleman-like action," "irresistible ludicro-solemn slyness," "roguish twinkles," and "hats and handkerchiefs flying," present but a sorry contrast to the "long and silent prayer," the "weepings and moanings," the "fear of God and orderly discipline," "the Metropolitan with his exhortation," and the "deacon in his albe" of the ancient Spanish council. For ourselves, we do not scruple to confess, that little as we like the playhouse, if we were compelled to go to one or the other, we would as lieve go thither as to this celebrated Hall on a show-day.

ART. IX.—*The Training System adopted in the Model Schools of the Glasgow Educational Society, a Manual for Infant and Juvenile Schools, which includes a System of Moral Training, suited to the Condition of large Towns.* By David Stow, Esq. one of the Secretaries of the Glasgow Education Society, and Author of “Moral Training.” 12mo. pp. 234. Published by R. M’Phun, Trongate, Glasgow; and N. H. Cotes, Cheap-side, London. 1836.

THE work which stands at the head of this article, is one of a numerous class that has recently issued from the press on the subject of education. Scarcely any of these productions are from the pens of members of our own Church. The few which are so, consist of little more than abridgements, containing scanty and insufficient details, and give at best an imperfect notion of what requires above all things to be clearly and thoroughly understood. We have, therefore, been induced to select as the heading of this article, a book proceeding from the north, which has this recommendation for our purpose, that it professes to comprise the essence of whatever has been put forth by other writers, and to sum up what is good and desirable in their works. The connexion which the book, in name at least, has with a religious community of different principles from our own Church, will at once make it evident that we do not hold it up to admiration on account of any bearing it might be supposed to have on sacred things, or that we wished to infuse any of the spirit or principles of the kirk into the system of our own schools. But, even this caution is needless; for, in fact, there is nothing of religion in the manual of Mr. Stow. *Moral training* is the burden of his production, which may be fairly described, consistently with what he has said himself, as a condensation or adaptation of other men’s thoughts, English and foreign as well as Scotch, and a simple enumeration of principles and practices by which we may most hopefully endeavour to influence the minds of the young. He has followed in the train of many others; and because he has profited by their errors, as well as their observations, he may be considered on the whole to have executed his task the best.

Most heartily do we wish that the Church of England at the present hour had a schoolmaster’s manual for general use, of a comprehensive and perfect kind; a manual, we mean, that should embody, if not all the details, yet all the important principles of the different improvements and discoveries which have been made in the practical working and management of schools; which should distinguish the mere mechanism of a system of education, (the method and means which are employed,) from the

springs by which such machinery is worked; which should preserve the everlasting principles of religion in their proper place, give them free play, assert the rightful authority they possess, and show how they, like the master-mind in the factory, must rule and direct the movements of the vast engine, while beams and mighty levers, and wheels within wheels, are subservient to their will and power, and which would adapt all such matter to the special and immediate necessities of the Church and the times in which we live. Such a work has been a manifest desideratum since the day that our bishops, with certain other benevolent persons, publicly associated themselves together for the promoting of the education of the poor in the principles of the Established Church, under the name of "The National Society." It is a want which continues to be felt to the present hour. We have had, indeed, for some time, it is true, the works of Dr. Bell put forth in various forms and under different names, as "Mutual Tuition and Moral Discipline," as "A Manual of public and Private Education," and as "Instructions for conducting Schools through the Agency of the Scholars themselves;" and we have had a motley and somewhat pigmy progeny, who owed their birth to his works, under diverse titles—"The System of Instruction for Masters in National Schools, by the Rev. F. Iremonger;" "The Practical Manual of the Madras System of Education," written by a schoolmaster while passing through the central school himself; "A Guide for Masters and Mistresses who propose to conduct Schools on the plan of Dr. Bell." But the variety of matter which it is here attempted to condense into the compass of a few pages, and the confusion between principles and practices which is apparent in all, except perhaps Mr. Iremonger's little work, the history of the system, and the incidents connected with the success of Dr. Bell, the irrelevant and controversial matter which is introduced in the form of notes, the superabundance of hard words and technical phrases,—“simultaneous instruction”—“reiterated and unreiterated spelling”—“syllabic and mono and poly-syllabic and promiscuous reading”—“reading by pauses and clauses”—“previous repetition of initiatory lessons,” &c. to which are superadded chapters on the elements of arithmetic, on building and fitting up schools, on grammar, classical, and ladies' boarding schools, &c. are enough to confuse the mind of any but a very experienced practitioner. It is to us a matter of amazement how the National Society, with the use of such tools, has been able to accomplish the work, which we know, from the testimony of our own eyes and ears, it has done, but which we hardly could have credited on evidence of any other kind. We are far from denying that there are traits of genius or originality about

the works of Dr. Bell which render them exceedingly valuable, and will always give them consequence in the history of education, but the good matter lies embedded in so deep and impenetrable a mass, that we should never dream of directing men, who are as yet unable to distinguish the rough ore from the earth, to attempt to draw their riches or resources out of such a mine.

To our apprehension, the subject is of first-rate importance. Next to an institution for the practical and experimental training of schoolmasters, and their proper instruction in the matters which they are to teach, which is the one thing needful for the success of any national scheme of education, we give the place to a manual for the schoolmaster's use. By such a book we mean a set of principles by which he may be governed in his professional career;—a work which (whether he may have been regularly trained for his office or not) will form a constant monitor and remembrancer of the motives by which he ought to be governed in the discharge of his duty; a guide which will prove to him what is settled and immovable in regard to education, because it is determined and laid down by God, and what is discretionary, to be adopted or not, according to the taste and requirements of the teacher, the wants of the children and the nature of the school;—where the mark is drawn to which in every case he must endeavour to attain, and proper limits defined, within which his own invention and that of others may be allowed to take their free range.

At the hazard of failing in a task which has hitherto baffled the attempts of abler and perhaps more experienced educationists than ourselves, we shall endeavour to describe the leading features of such a manual as we think is required for our national schools. We gladly contribute our mite to the treasury of the Church, and shall be happy if the discussion of the subject shall in any manner lead to the publishing of the book we require, or the rectifying and adapting for its purposes any book which the public may at present possess.

I. In the first place, we conceive that the teachers of our youthful population should be made to understand clearly the position in which they stand; that whatever may be the worldly advantages or inconveniences which surround them, their office is not only of an important, but in a moral and religious view, of a high and dignified nature, and their responsibilities are much greater than those of other men. They are not merely to frame and fashion the outward behaviour of youth, but they are helpers to the ministry of the Lord in the training up of immortal souls; they labour between the pastors and the lambs of the Lord's flock. They are to prepare the youthful mind for receiving the

good seed which the appointed labourer in the vineyard is to sow and water that it may be blessed by God. It is important that they should consider and feel their own dignity in this respect, and, on the other hand, that they should be duly convinced of the subordinate nature of the occupation they are engaged in as not being teachers or ministers of religion themselves. But although they are not in the ministry, on their exertions and the success of their toil will in great measure depend the moral and religious character of the class for which they are now concerned. What then are the qualifications which such a class of men ought to possess? The answer to this inquiry involves another point on which the manual of the Christian schoolmaster ought to treat, and on this we are disposed to offer a few words.

II. In the judgment of every Churchman there are certain indispensable requisites connected, 1, with religious profession and belief; 2, with a regular, moral, and exemplary course of life; and 3, with the natural bias and turn of a man's disposition, without which it would be unreasonable to look for success in such an undertaking. That a man who offers himself for the management of a Church of England School, should be deliberately and from conviction a member of that Church, is almost a truism, though we apprehend that like some other matters which are self-evident when examined, it has not been generally inquired into, as it ought to be. We should wish to see a chapter in such a work as we contemplate, which, with some very little enlargement and comment, would bring home to a man's heart, who proposed to be a schoolmaster, such questions as these :—" Have
 " I, as a Christian, for my own personal edification, read the Bible
 " and considered the subjects it proposes with all the seriousness
 " becoming eternal things? Can I conscientiously recommend
 " and give a reason for such advice as this, viz. that baptism, private
 " prayer, public worship, confirmation, and the Lord's Supper,
 " should be attended to, and the formularies of the Church of
 " England be embraced? The tree will be judged of by its
 " fruits; has my life such manifest evidences of the principles by
 " which I am actuated as may assist in guiding all those who will
 " be influenced by my example into the way in which they ought
 " to go? Conduct which will pass without reproach in the
 " world may be very incapable of bearing the gaze and inquisi-
 " tive scrutiny of the young; children learn far more by imita-
 " tion than in any other manner, and are ever watchful for the
 " failings of one who is appointed to correct their own faults;
 " the inquiry, therefore, is by no means of a trifling kind; have I
 " the answer of a good conscience on this matter?" And then, if in these respects the result be satisfactory, the natural bent and

disposition of one who sets up as a teacher and guide to others, is of the most important concern. An unfortunate defect in any of the bodily organs, natural infirmities of various kinds, a manner which is morose or reserved and shy, and other constitutional and unavoidable difficulties, may any of them frustrate the good intentions which a pious man may have formed. “Am I clear of the charge of putting myself forward presumptuously against manifest disqualifications such as these?”

III. The general principles which should govern a man in the undertaking of an office being settled, we think that some profitable and awakening reflections might be grounded upon the evil consequences of failing in his task; the reproach which may be brought upon religion; the abuse of benefactions given for the succour and improvement of the poor, offer considerations of weight by which an ingenuous mind would be affected; and still more impressive are thoughts connected with the anxious and reasonable expectations of parents for their offspring, and the all-important interests of the young ones themselves, and the irreparable loss which they sustain if their teacher is unequal to his work. A man might be checked in a thoughtless determination of engaging as a schoolmaster by such reflections,—or, if he had already undertaken the work, he might be stimulated to exertion by the suggestions which conscience would make with regard to them.

IV. Besides the arguments of this nature, it appears an office of charity and kindness to a man who is deliberating upon the choice of his profession, or who has determined to devote himself to scholastic pursuits, to set before him plainly and fully the dangers and difficulties by which he will be surrounded, as well as the encouragements which may cheer him in his course. At least let us give him the opportunity of counting the cost, and measuring the work before him, not by the groundless theories of a warm imagination, but by the sober and literal realities of the case. He will be removed from the influence of immoral society and its temptations, and led, by the nature of his office, to the performance of religious duties; but there is difficulty and danger in the kind of familiarity he will have with sacred things. The facts and arguments and books with which he is perpetually engaged may become less interesting to him every year; the freshness and elasticity of his spirits may fade away, and chilling coldness and indifference usurp a dominion over his soul. In many cases it may not be granted him to see the fruits of his labour, or to reap the harvest which he sowed. The heart will sicken when hope is deferred, and if the hands are once enfeebled, and the knees and limbs shake, the chill which comes over him will spread

itself throughout his school, and the hope of better things hereafter will be lost. We are far from entertaining any unfavourable opinion of the success of education in the main; on the contrary, we are persuaded, that although a pious education be not universally successful in bringing children into a truly religious state, yet it is undoubtedly appointed by God for this end, and is, on the whole, more frequently attended with success than any other means of grace. But there are seasons when the harvest and vintage will fail, and a man must, in some measure, be prepared for these. His faith must be in God; he must be habitually a man of prayer; the supply of his strength must be continually descending from above; he must have confidence in his work, because it is the work of God, and because of the heavenly promise. And then, but then only, may he look forward with a hope that maketh not ashamed to the reward of his toil; his fidelity in the few things that pertain to the welfare of his little school shall be met with a far higher and more abundant reward than they deserve; and those he has turned to righteousness shall hereafter be as jewels in his heavenly crown that shall shine everlastingly in the kingdom of his Father. There are persons of our own communion, we believe, who from an apprehension of enthusiasm on the one hand, or hypocrisy on the other, are reluctant to invest the office of schoolmaster with the religious character which we assign to it here. To us it appears a sufficient answer to all the objections which can be offered of this nature, to observe that if a direct religious result is looked for by the education of the poor, the means must be adapted to the end desired. We should expect any schoolmaster we might employ, not only to teach the children to pray themselves, but to be fervent and earnest in commending them, by his own prayers, to God; and if this part of his duty were fully and effectually performed, we should conceive that there would be little room for dispute or difficulty as to the extent to which his other instruction in religion should go.

V. Although faith and piety be indispensable in a Church of England schoolmaster, yet all men equally pious and well-intentioned are not equally fit for that office. It appears to us, therefore, that it would be useful to single out the particular virtues and illustrate the proper manner of exercising them in the practical business and trials of a school. It is easiest to explain our meaning by examples, and doubtless an enlargement upon the few qualities we shall specify would furnish ample matter for a division of such a work as has been described.

The *patience*, for instance, of schoolmasters is especially tried; we would have it shown how essential to success the cultivation

of this virtue is. The work of tuition must be gradual and slow in every stage; children are narrow-mouthed vessels into which a little only can be poured at a time. To hurry or to terrify them with a threat is to check the thoughtfulness we ought to endeavour to excite. Their minds are like soil of different depths, some of a nature to make the seed open at once, and others to retain it until the rain and the snow shall have come down from heaven and caused it to swell gradually and develop the principle of life which it contains. One secret of all good teaching may perhaps be summed up, and patience enforced by a single text, —“ *the doctrine must drop as the rain and distil as the dew, as the small rain upon the tender herb, and as showers upon the grass.*”

Humility is a grace of which teachers stand in special need. Their superiority over their daily companions, the absolute authority they enjoy, their temptations to display when they succeed, the pride and flattery of ill-educated parents, who find their children to be better scholars than themselves, the pomp and *puff* by which public examinations are too often marked, all render it expedient that the true grounds and principles of humility should be laid open to their view. *Sagacity and judgment* of a peculiar description are required in schools; the dealing with different dispositions, the interminable variety of petty cases which require to be settled, the necessity for promptness and decision in what is said or done, show the importance of faculties of this description, which, although in some respects properly accounted gifts, are capable of improvement and developement in those who possess them in the smallest degree. Again, *justice and equity* are properties which are called into exercise continually in a school; they are the life and soul of good discipline, and give a character to actions of the most trifling kind. Without these principles in active and constant exercise, decisions must be given through bias and prejudice which ought to be grounded on detached and independent facts; behaviour at one period will meet with the reward or the punishment which on some other occasion will be pardoned or overlooked; favouritism will usurp the place of impartiality, the private inconveniences or misfortunes of the teacher will be visited in anger upon the school, and among the children all confidence and respect for the decision of their master will die away. Mildness and forbearance, consideration and self-command, firmness and decision are intimately connected with the principles to which we here allude. And, then in addition to all these, there are *cheerfulness and good temper*, which are of the greatest necessity in conducting schools. There are principles upon which these qualities may be formed, habits which are

favourable to their cultivation and growth, rules which are needful to prevent their abuse. Withal, there is a *dignity of manner* and of character which a schoolmaster ought always to maintain; there is a reverence and respect due to children, as well as to himself; there is a proper reserve to be exercised towards them, and a proper distance to be maintained, at the same time that candour and openness of manner are exemplified in his own behaviour, as well as taught by his words. It is a great matter to understand the foundation upon which all such conduct ought to rest, and the opportunities which exist for exercising it, and the profitable account to which those opportunities may be turned. We would merely notice further, before quitting this division, a few duties devolving upon schoolmasters, which give scope for exercising the principles we here treat of:—1, Caution in laying down rules; 2, a knowledge of the proper limits of authority; 3, an understanding of his proper station, as he is placed between the children and the promoters of the school; 4, proper methods of treating the children as responsible to their parents and to God; 5, right conduct towards the parents of the children themselves when they visit the school; 6, due influence over pupils who have ceased to attend his instructions and are settled in the world.

Every one, we are persuaded, must feel the advantage which a schoolmaster would possess who entered upon his office and the difficulties attending it, with a set of correct principles of action formed in his mind on these and other points, instead (as commonly is the case) of having to contend with embarrassing circumstances, and too often attain to right motives of conduct only by perceiving the ill effect of mistakes into which he has been betrayed.

VI. The remarks which have been hitherto made, relate to general principles of conduct towards all persons connected with the institution over which he is appointed to preside. The particular business of the school itself should be equally conducted under the guidance of settled rules; motives of conduct for all occasions of ordinary occurrence should be understood and thought on till they appear to have become a habit and a part of the mind, and the every day routine of educational business should be conducted in subservience to them. It is far too commonly the case that a man is supposed to be formed into a schoolmaster so soon as he knows the methods of arranging and classifying children, of distributing lessons and keeping the *marked-books*, and the registers of the school, and of taking and losing places in a class, with such like formal details of the mere mechanical routine of a national school. But, we scruple not to affirm, that whatever assistance these practices may furnish, under the guidance of principles, they are absolutely worthless in themselves—they can at best only serve to conceal the want of a proper system of educa-

tion, and to defer the disclosure of the evil to a future day, when the opportunity for remedying it is passed.

What is important in the world, is equally so in schools, and we could wish that on all occasions the difficulties should be strongly and clearly represented to the mind of him by whom they ought to be overcome. For this reason only, and not in any manner as an objection to schools themselves, we should think it right to insist, (in such a work as we refer to) even at considerable length, on the following facts:—1, That the proper scene for moral and religious probation and training is home (not school), that school at best can only be regarded as an auxiliary to the parents in the discharge of their duties, and never can supersede the necessity for what they ought to do themselves; 2, that it is a very serious objection to schools that religion must, in a great measure, be taught in them as a task; 3, that it must be given, not, from time to time, as the fitting opportunity arises, or as food convenient for the bodily necessities is taken in, to satisfy the cravings which nature makes, but it is taught as a form; and 4, that the same truths are taught to children who have, indeed, pretty nearly the same mental powers, but whose religious affections differ probably as decidedly as the colour of their clothes; and since it is on the condition of the heart rather than the head, that the success of all religious teaching depends, the instruction is not given (to say the least) under circumstances the most favourable for success. A conviction of such difficulties as these will dispose the intelligent school-master to look out for the best remedies which the experience of others may have suggested, or his own observation may devise for these inherent and natural defects in every large and flourishing school. He must bear in mind that every evil may be mitigated, if it cannot be cured. Much may be done by contrivance to vary the irksomeness of lessons, and bring sound doctrine with proper freshness and attractiveness before the mind;—mechanical repetitions of serious truths, which are often resorted to for the mere purpose of gaining a power or habit of distinct articulation, may be entirely set aside, and the desirable faculty of a clear enunciation created by exercises of a different kind; the individual characters of children may be studied; a variety of occupation may be sought which shall divest the school instruction of the formality and pedantry by which it is too often characterised; and, through the medium of the clergy and visitors of the school, a very considerable corrective influence may be exercised upon the parents, as well as the scholars, the effects of which will soon be apparent, and strengthen the hands of the teacher in carrying out improvements of the most important nature.

VII. We hold that with reference to the direct business of a school, a great deal might be said with advantage on the following points, treating them, as we have before observed, not as mere objects of attainment in order to the exhibition of a well managed school, but as principles, by the operation and enforcement of which the school itself is to be made such as it ought to be. 1, *Order*, for instance, is not only desirable in itself for the comfort and benefit of all parties who are shut up together in a room for six hours in a day, but it may be made to have a direct moral influence over the mind; 2, of *neatness* and *cleanliness*, of *delicacy* and *politeness*, the same may be said; 3, *quietness* requires an exercise of self-command on the part of children, as well as affording them ease and assisting in a proper intonation of voice while their exercises are performed together in a busy room; 4, *obedience*, as a religious principle, is never to be lost sight of or trifled with, although the schoolmaster were willing to forego the comfort which results from having his own commands observed at once; 5, *attention* is indispensable for the present success of the school; but a volatile unsettled humour, if not gently altered and wisely corrected in early years, will have an unhappy influence through life, and hinder the attainment of any great excellence in whatever business may be undertaken. 6, *Intelligence* and *animation* characterise the proceedings of one school, while dulness and heaviness oppress the operations of another which is situated, perhaps, in the very next village or adjoining street. The ground of difference may not be in the attainments of the master, or even of the children themselves, but in other causes, which it is especially desirable should be set forth and illustrated from real life. After the same manner it is very expedient that the right use and improvement, 7, of *memory* should be understood; that parrot-like exercises should cease in our schools, and that such measures should be systematically adopted as will engage the understanding in the exercise of learning by heart, which is too commonly an operation of the most mechanical and unintellectual nature it is possible to conceive. 8, The management of *teachers*, the things they are capable of doing, and those which it is unfit they should do, the limits of their authority, the relative position they hold with regard to the other boys, the principles upon which they are to be selected, the advantages and disadvantages to which they are exposed, are matters of the utmost importance to be understood aright. It is by far too common to select teachers with a respect exclusively to their intellectual powers, rather than give a due consideration of the moral and constitutional qualities of the individual selected; they are seldom made to understand that the trust and authority reposed in them can only be adequately

discharged by their affording themselves an example of general good conduct in the school ; it is seldom understood by schoolmasters that the habits of accuracy, the mental discipline, the frequent appeal to their own resources do far more than compensate to the monitor for the time and labour he is induced to bestow on the improvement of his companions. But if these things, which are essential to the free and full working of the system of mutual instruction were generally apprehended, a variety of acknowledged abuses would be avoided ;—many weak and absurd objections, which are sometimes urged against the national system, would cease to be heard, and a practical evidence would be constantly at hand, in the actual condition of the whole company of teachers belonging to a school, to contradict the surmises of speculators, who condemn a system which they probably have neither studied, nor tried, nor even seen properly applied. 9, It is too little remembered in superintending a school, that the master ought not only to be able to direct, but to be capable of practically executing all his own commands in a manner superior to any one else. It has been said that the teacher should be in his place like a fogle-man before soldiers, exhibiting every movement and grace with which their exercises should be performed. The remark is in some respects true also of the master of the school himself. This, at all events, he must especially observe, that he never should violate the rules by which his youthful deputies are bound to act ; that he should himself do every thing in the same manner and by the same means that he requires it to be done by them. Schoolmasters too commonly speak of reserving to themselves a liberty of breaking their own rules, which is almost fatal to the efficiency and steadiness of lads who are restricted in the means which they may use. No youth will believe but that a liberty of varying the method of enforcing his wishes would facilitate his labour, and there are few who will not take the first opportunity, when they are unobserved, of trying some experiment of this nature for themselves.

VIII. When, by the preceding, or various similar methods, and by the inculcating of those principles upon which such things depend, the general conduct of the schoolmaster towards those with whom he is concerned is properly regulated, and the special business of the schoolroom is satisfactorily arranged and settled, we conceive that it might be desirable that a schoolmaster's manual should offer certain hints and well digested advice as to methods in which his moral and religious influence over his pupils might be enforced or extended. We gather the idea from Bishop Wilson in his rules for the petty schools in the Isle of Man, that private, and occasionally public exhortation in his schoolroom,

may be employed with good effect for the benefit of the children. Something certainly may be taught this way of the duties of self-examination and self-government, and gratitude towards those from whom kindnesses are received; a variety of casual circumstances arising out of the ordinary business of the school may furnish the *mollia tempora fandi*, when the doctrine or duty which is inculcated will come home to the heart of a child. It is especially desirable, that in this manner the learning of the school should be connected with domestic concerns and the every day affairs of life. Without launching forth into declamation or being suspected, by the most cautious, of interfering with the preacher's office, the general habits of the man may serve as a powerful comment on any words of exhortation he may use to inculcate a reverence for the Bible, a desire after the knowledge of its contents, a peculiar solemnity of feeling in reference to the great doctrines of salvation which it propounds; his pursuits on the Lord's day, the cheerful character which he gives to the lessons of that day; the arrangements which he makes, without observation or display, to lessen the tedium of school attendance and public services, which children are naturally so apt to feel, his efforts to give interest and infuse piety into the services they are called upon to pay to God, the advantage he may take for creating some variety on occasion of the festivals and special services of the Church, these may produce impressions favourable to virtue and religion, which the scoffings of the world and all carnal allurements shall afterwards (by the help of God) assail in vain; and particularly, if he can succeed in creating a habit of prayer, and a system of dependence upon the help it brings, and a love of communion and access to God, he will have obtained the best possible security for the present and future well-being of the individual for whom he is concerned.

IX. The subject of *Discipline* opens a large and entirely new field, in which the best possible service may be done to our schools by the writer or compiler of such a work as we desire to obtain. Various methods of reward and of punishment in every form and degree are proposed in a desultory and incomplete manner in the books to which we have already referred. But the subject undoubtedly requires an extent of consideration and of systematic arrangement to which we can hardly do more than allude.

1. The proper principles to which a Christian should appeal in the enforcement of all discipline ought certainly to be understood; and the rule of gentleness and love, which was inculcated in the gospel, and exemplified in the series of constraining encouragements with which the sermon and exhortation of our

blessed Lord began, ought, in the first place, to be faithfully and fully tried.

2. The vehemence of the passions and affections of the young, and their want of experience and of reasoning power, should be carefully considered and thoroughly investigated before any violent remedy is applied by unskilful hands. A distinction must be carefully drawn, and uniformly observed, between the habits of vice and wickedness which are settled and rooted in the heart, and the sallies of petulance, the unmeasured esteem for trifling kindnesses, and the sudden outbreakings of hatred and revenge, which sometimes proceed almost as much from the irregularities of the body or the blood, as of the heart.

3. There is undoubtedly a proper mode of dealing with children suited to their peculiar infirmities and their age, which, if it is not adopted at all times and seasons, ought at least to be recognised and acknowledged in the school as the method most suitable to the inmates and the place. The schoolmaster of old gave the liveliest illustration of it by causing the pictures of joy and gladness to be painted around his room. And assuredly it is a duty to render education as little unpleasant as we can; enticements and encouragements are never more completely in their right place, than when the dulness of the head and the perverseness of the heart are to be overcome. Gloom and moroseness are unsuitable to the feelings and sympathies of children, and render them suspicious of the subject and instruction which is brought forward in such an uninviting and repulsive form.

4. Again, it is particularly needful, at the present time, that the real principle of emulation, the extent to which it may with propriety be employed, and the object and design of its use at all, should be rightly explained. A re-action has begun to take place with regard to this useful auxiliary in the management of school business, and because of the abuse of the principle some benevolent promoters of education threaten us with the exclusion of it altogether from their schools. And, no doubt, if the losing places in a class and an appeal to emulation is to be made the sovereign remedy in every case, the decision of such persons may be judicious. If there is nothing in the view of the child beyond the mere outward honor or disgrace of rising or falling in the ranks of his competitors, it is time that emulation as a part of the national system were done away. But we think that it might easily be explained and understood, even by the children themselves, that in a class of scholars *generally* equal as to their abilities, some trifling differences will always exist; that according to these differences, each one among them might have his proper place assigned him in the ranks. That in such an arrangement there

would be no personal honour in standing at the top of the class, and no disgrace in standing last, for each would hold the rank which had actually been assigned to him by Providence—i. e. by God. But, the children being thus arranged, if it were to appear after the temporary absence of the master that one scholar had risen, and another had fallen above or below the place which each was qualified to hold, then their respective positions in the class would show the comparative attention or idleness with which he had behaved during that time. It is to this extent only, or at most, as a subsidiary index of the fluctuations which take place in the progress of children who are nearly equal in scholarship, that we think emulation should be used.

5. We shall be easily betrayed into too great length if we follow out the subjects which present themselves under this division to our minds. We will only say that a number of invaluable materials for thought and reflection, as connected with discipline, might be furnished to the schoolmaster by discussing such topics as these; that in correcting a fault we should seek and aim at correcting the motive from whence the transgression proceeded; that the ultimate good of the offender and his companions in the school should be the object we always keep in view, that we should endeavour to prevent a habit of ill-humour, and avoiding whatever irritates the feelings, consistently with our authority and firmness, should as often as possible assign a reason for any system of acting we may adopt, if it is known to be disagreeable to a child. The diverting of attention and the calling forth into exercise and action some different and countervailing affections of the mind, are frequently of service in the rectifying of the temper or heart. In timid, nervous children the truth of this remark is apparent, and the remedy to be applied when they fail should certainly be adapted to their state. Children should be treated with considerable respect, should always be deemed innocent until guilt is proved: should be addressed at all times as if under those religious promises and obligations which were made for them when they were dedicated to God. A sense of delicacy with a tender and open conscience is to be cultivated in them with all possible care. The difficulties which in large schools arise from the intermixture of pupils, though in some degree doubtless they always will exist, yet admit of being mitigated or obviated, like evils of every other kind, and we would gladly see some sober remedies proposed for this purpose. *Praise and blame*, their just and moderate use as stimulants, would come within the subjects we desire to see discussed as part of discipline, together with the proportionate importance which we are justified in attaching to excellence of an intellectual as compared with that of

a moral or religious kind. Hope and fear; punishment and reward; corporal punishment for moral offences, the extent to which a spiritual or a literal meaning is to be assigned to those texts of scripture which speak of *the rod*, the degree in which gospel principles may have banished the necessity for recourse to such remedies, or the extent to which they may have been permitted in ancient times, because of the hardness of men's hearts; expulsion, the last resource, like the cutting off the limb and leaving it to perish, that the life with the body may be preserved, these and a multitude of other points would easily be enumerated if the limits of our space would permit.

10. And besides all these, we think it would be highly convenient, if at the conclusion of such a work as we propose a small variety of specimens were given of the method of keeping common school registers and books, the notices in use for the parents when the children break the rules; plans for the arrangement of the lessons and distribution of time, subjects of study arranged according to the proficiency and age of children in classes, with the names of various institutions in which the plans described, or something similar, might be seen in operation. Nor would we omit to add to such a book a few suitable prayers and hints for the religious exercises, in private, of the persons for whom it was especially prepared, together with a short list of books, which every schoolmaster might be expected to have procured and have ready for use in supplying such further information as he might require. But already perhaps we have been led into needless and unprofitable detail; and in the pursuit of the remedy for a want which we have long experienced, have lost sight of the object which was in view when these remarks were commenced. We intended to have dwelt more at length on the work which we mentioned at first, and to have used it for illustrating the particular nature of our own urgent wants. But the scheme or outline which had arranged itself before our imagination has got possession of the pen, and we must confine ourselves to a few extracts only of passages which we are most disposed to approve in the production of Mr. Stow.

Perhaps there is rather more of new contrivance and attempt at originality in the work of this gentleman, than in what we desire to see prepared for English schools. He has endeavoured to cull every thing which is excellent in schools of *every description*, and to adapt the fruits of his ramble to his own use. The description is interesting, and we doubt not the mechanism and arrangements of the Glasgow Model School are efficient, and deserve the reputation which we are assured it has already acquired; but we very much question whether some parts of the

plan of Mr. Stow do not involve an extent of personal labour and continued exertion, which are quite unsuited to the constitution of ordinary English schools, and we believe also of the generality of Scotch schools. Like our own institutions, they are managed by a single teacher, who cannot preside with effect through the whole day, and consequently they are unprovided with the apparatus that the *training system*, so called *par excellence*, requires. The adaptation of the infant school practices and the system of combining them with those of the ordinary juvenile schools; the watching of the children while at play, with a view to the understanding of their character and propensities; the *covered* and the *uncovered* school-room, with the teaching in the gallery and the lecture or exercise by elipsis; constitute the chief peculiarities of the system recommended by Mr. Stow, and pursued at Glasgow. It will have been seen that, like him, we had contemplated the study of individual character, the formation of habits, and a kind and degree of moral and religious influence on the part of the schoolmaster, which we regret is not generally obtained; but we think that more feasible methods might be devised for such purposes than those which the Glasgow seminary proposes, excellent as they undoubtedly are in themselves. Our principal objection to Mr. Stow's *publication* is grounded on the inordinate quantity of matter and variety of subjects which he has pretended to embody in the compass of a duodecimo of rather more than 200 pages; the work is not digested and arranged with perspicuity, though the matter itself is generally intelligible and clear, and the recommendations that are given very often evince a sagacity and penetration which would lead to the supposition that he is well acquainted with the practice as well as the theory of schools, and the general condition of the working classes, for whose benefit the schools are designed. We shall strengthen some of the propositions we have announced in our scheme of a Christian schoolmaster's manual by the results of his observation, and the conclusions to which he has come.

On the importance of applying the doctrines and precepts of religion to regulate the mind and life of children, he writes,—

“ We all know and feel the power of habits which gradually form a *second nature*, and yet where are the seminaries for training to good and proper habits? Almost all that is aimed at in week-day elementary schools is head-knowledge. Moral habits are left to form themselves, or to be formed in the streets, or by the transient hour or half-hour of the morning and evening which parents can afford at home.”—p. 18.

And again, at p. 151.

“ We must also keep in view that the cultivation of the religious and

moral sentiments and habits is the primary object of the training system, as it ought to be in every system of education; and that time and practice alone enable any man to meet and surmount all the difficulties which, day by day present themselves in the moral training of a week-day school."

With regard to rendering the business of the school-room as pleasurable as possible to the pupils, he observes,—

"In every lesson, it is of great importance that every point be vividly pictured out to the child in such a manner as to give a reality to the subject or word presented to the child's attention. Some wander so far from their subject, that the original topic is lost sight of; others adhere so rigidly and drily to it as to deprive themselves of the natural associations and analogies, which tend to give it greater vividness and interest, and to rivet it in the memory."—p. 52.

And again, p. 160.

"School books are almost all too didactic and abstruse. The chief books wanted are one or two cheap collections for ordinary (not scriptural) reading in schools, for children seven or eight years of age or upwards, consisting of extracts from general science, and each extract illustrated by a picture."

The simplicity and plainness which become a teacher are properly enforced.

"We doubt not but some individuals will say this style of catechising, or *exercising rather*, (it is the method by elipsis to which he refers,) is too childish and simple. Now, we acknowledge that it is both simple and child-like, though not childish. Simplicity is our aim, and it is the feelings and thoughts and actions of children that we propose to develop and regulate. The difficulty has not been the want of comprehension on the part of the children so much as the abstruse manner frequently of putting questions. Using words above the comprehension of children is quite as absurd as to speak in a foreign tongue."

On memory his remarks may be taken as in illustration of those which we have made.

"Every lesson ought to pass first into the understanding; that is, the child ought not to commit it to memory in the first instance, and then afterwards have it explained, for the mere words are, to a certain extent, a barrier to the understanding, when got by rote; but reverse the process, and the increased effect is very apparent. If any list of answers or a few verses are to be committed to memory, let the children be first exercised upon the meaning, &c., and then, but not till then, may they commit the words in regular order."—p. 162.

Mr. Stow is well aware of the principles needful to be observed for exciting intelligence in a school; he tells us very justly, that the mere amount of instruction is not so much the object as its nature and quality, and the habit of considering, re-

flecting, and reducing to practice what is taught and read; and, that—

“There are several faults into which teachers are likely to fall; one is that of telling too much to their pupils; they may receive the information with pleasure and appear to profit by it; but a great evil arises from such a mode of instruction; their minds remain almost passive, and they acquire a habit of receiving impressions from others at a time when they ought to be gaining mental power by the exertion of their own faculties.”—p. 133; 178.

His view of the duties and office of the parent and of the subsidiary nature of a school, in filling up a void which might be supplied far better by the father or mother, under a perfect state of things, is precisely in accordance with our own.

“We trust it will not be imagined for a moment that we undervalue parental instruction and training at home. We have already stated our sentiments on this subject, and at the same time shown the extreme, nay insurmountable, difficulty the working classes labour under, in towns, in the moral training of their offspring.”—p. 120.

On the necessity of exercising discretion in giving praise he has a useful note, p. 131.

“It is but too common a practice to call a child good because he gives a right answer, thus confounding intellectual truth and moral virtue.”

On emulation and the usual method of exciting it he justly observes,—

“In some points such intellectual stimulants are a barrier to moral training, from the feelings they engender. The struggle in school is generally transferred to the conduct at home, and may be detected in the habit of detraction and finding fault. We would use stimulants when it can be clearly seen that no sacrifice is made of the amiable and moral qualities.

“Ambition is a noble principle implanted in our breast by our Creator for wise purposes; and in Scripture we are called upon to be ambitious. Some, therefore, would argue that struggling for prizes in school must be a right exercise of this principle. The analogy however does not hold good; for the Scriptural prize is one which all may obtain, and in no case engenders any feelings which would tempt us to seek the downfall or failure of our neighbour or companion.”—p. 144.

Of punishments also he says, in accordance with the remarks which had occurred to us,

“Though we by no means dispense with punishment, but, on the contrary, follow in its spirit the precept of Solomon, yet we ought to state that the *literal rod* has not been used in the Model Juvenile School during the last two years and a half. Social sympathy and the united

effects of the training in the play-ground, gallery, and by objects, have rendered corporal punishment comparatively unnecessary. Bringing a child who has offended into the middle of the floor, with his face turned towards or away from the rest of his companions, is found to be a severe punishment. To punish children by confining them in school after it is dismissed, or to cause them to read, for the same reason, three or four long chapters of the Scriptures, or commit to memory a few verses, or write an additional essay, is the direct way to train children to hate the school, their Bibles, and their lessons. What we desire children to love ought never to be associated in their minds with punishment."—p. 146.

We have quoted more than enough for the illustration of our own design, and sufficient, we trust, to draw attention to the importance of the subject. We should sincerely rejoice to see the work, which is so great a desideratum in our schools, proceed from any quarter, and obtain, as it undoubtedly would do forthwith, the sanction of the respectable body which presides over education within the pale of the Church of England.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

SINCE our last number the long anticipated Life of Mr. Wilberforce by his Sons has made its appearance; we hope to have an early opportunity of reviewing it, meanwhile it will be enough to notice, what is on the surface of the work, the exceedingly great pains which have been spent upon it, and its importance as an addition to the historical records of the times to which it belongs.

The most important theological work which has lately appeared is Mr. Palmer's Treatise on the Church, which also will, in due time, receive from us the careful attention which it claims from all Churchmen. Whatever judgment be formed of the conclusions to which he has come on the variety of points which he has had to consider, we cannot contemplate without admiration, and (if it were right) without envy, the thorough treatment which his subject has received at his hands. It is indeed a work quite in character with the religious movement which has lately commenced in different parts of the Church, displaying a magnificence of design similar to that of the Bishop of London's plan of fifty new Churches, and Dr. Pusey, of Oxford's, projected translation of the Fathers.

This latter arduous undertaking, we rejoice to know, is now beginning to show fruit, the original text of St. Austin's Confessions, for which five Oxford MSS. have been collated or re-collated, is now through the press, all but the index; the translation also will issue from the press in the course of a short time, as will also the translation of St. Cyril, of Jerusalem. A portion of St. Chrysostom's Comment on St. Paul's Epistles has been printed since Christmas; but an important reason for suspending it has lately occurred in the researches which have been made into the Paris MSS. which Montfaucon used in the Benedictine text. Nothing has been found to throw suspicion on his theological honesty, but enough to show that readings may be materially improved by re-collation. Re-collations are proceeding for the same reason in the Oxford text of St. Cyprian; but they will not interfere with the translation, which is ready to go to press at once. Meanwhile Mr. Bickersteth has brought out an interesting little volume of portions of the works of the Fathers of the first and second Century. The work is conceived in the best spirit, and can but elicit kind and respectful feelings even from those who consider that Mr. Bickersteth does not enjoy in full measure the pure light of catholic truth. May there be

less difference year by year between such men as him and them, and we think he is taking the way to fulfil the wish !

In Oxford, Mr. Parker's series of select Religious Works continues. Bishop Taylor's *Golden Grove*, Archbishop Laud's *Devotions*, Bishop Patrick's *Heart's Ease*, Dr. Sutton's *Meditations on the Lord's Supper*, and Hymns from the *Paris Breviary*, have already been published. These volumes present an appearance most appropriate to their contents, being beautifully printed and embellished, yet without an approach to the bad taste of the day. We are not quite satisfied with the judgment on which the *Breviary Hymns* are edited. A selection has been attempted ; now this seems to be impossible. In such compositions Romanism obtrudes itself sometimes in a mere word, where the hymn is otherwise catholic and beautiful ; and thus reduces a selector to the dilemma of omitting it altogether, or of seeming to countenance what is erroneous. We incline to think that in a second edition, which we hope soon to see, *all* should be printed, and the task of discriminating between them, which is not difficult, left to the reader. It is a curious coincidence, considering how little Dr. Sutton's works have been known of late years, that while his *Meditations* were publishing at Oxford, his *Disce Mori* (*Learn to Die*) has appeared in London, without any understanding between the respective editors. Our readers will not be sorry to have had this little work also warmly recommended to their attention.

Archbishop Laurence has published a third edition of his celebrated *Bampton Lectures*, also of his *Treatise on Baptism*, which is scarcely equal to them, and of his *Translation of the Book of Enoch*.

The little tract called " *A Catechism on the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church*," has, in the course of a few months, reached a third edition. As its sale shows, it is well adapted to distribution. In connection with which, though with no real connection beyond that of subject, may be mentioned a small Catechism, " *Of Scriptural Episcopacy*," published at Belfast. It contains much information in the course of a few pages.

A volume of Poems has been published at Oxford called the *Cathedral*, with a number of elegant wood cuts. These Poems have obscurities, as a great deal of poetry must have, and ever has had ; but we are greatly mistaken if they have not a long course of prospective influence in store for them.

No. 81 of the *Tracts for the Times*, which has been long expected, has at length appeared, and forms, by itself, a volume of above 400 closely printed pages. It is a catena of our divines on the subject of the *Eucharistic Sacrifice*, and is preceded by an historical sketch of the doctrine in our Church during the last 300 years. It completes vol. iv. which, though the longest, contains

fewer Tracts than any of the former. We wish to draw particular attention to the deep thoughts contained in No. 80, on the right mode of preaching the Gospel.

The first volume has appeared of a uniform edition of the Theological Works of that lamented prelate and most excellent man, Bishop Van Mildert.

We grieve to have to notice that Dr. Faussett, Margaret Professor, who is favourably known to the world by a volume of Bampton Lectures before he was Professor, and a sermon against Mr. Milman since, has preached and published a Sermon against Mr. Froude's Remains. We trust this ill-advised step will not plunge the University into a new controversy. It is indeed deplorable that at a time when our enemies are at our gates, Dr. Faussett, without being able to point out one doctrine of our Articles or Prayer-book as infringed, should choose such a moment above all others for suddenly breaking silence in an attack on some of our Church's most devoted sons. No step more acceptable than his to Dissenters and Papists, Liberals and Destructives, can be conceived; and the more so as taken by a man who, however he himself may draw subtle distinctions, is in *their* eyes quite as much a bigot and a formalist as those whom he attacks. At this time of day the word of no one man, unsupported either by argument or by appeal to authority, can stop the course of thought in the University, or deter inquiring minds from following the paths of Hooker, Andrews and Bull, or of their masters, Irenæus or Cyprian. It is understood that a letter is being addressed to him by Mr. Newman. Before our next number it is to be hoped this lamentable affair will be at an end.

Dr. Adams, of Cambridge, Lady Margaret's Preacher, has published a Treatise to show that the "sealed book" in Rev. v. 1. is the Old Testament; that its unsealing is still to come, and will be equivalent to a new revelation; that its authentic copy was carried from Jerusalem to Rome, is still in the Vatican, and when brought to light will be the means of converting the Jews.

Various volumes of Sermons, some from distinguished persons, have been published in London during the last quarter. Bishop Mant's Sermons, on the Church and her Ministrations (Rivingtons), are but a specimen of what that excellent man is and has been all through his life, a witness for catholic truth against innovation and heresy.—Dr. Moberly's "Practical Sermons" (Rivingtons) unite singular clearness and exactness of thought, with the earnestness and profitableness which their title promises.—Mr. Smith's, preached at the Temple Church (Fellowes), are sound Sermons, sometimes deep, and sometimes rather dry, on the subjects to which he limits himself. It is that limitation which occasions this dryness so far as it exists.—Though we have pleasure in agreeing with Mr. Melvill on many most important points, there certainly are others on which we differ from him. Yet in spite of this we should feel his

Sermons (Rivingtons) as impressive as they are beautiful, were it not for his never-ending use of the word "we," "we," "we;" which, as often as it occurs, unpleasantly draws one back from his subject to himself, and makes his volume like a series of reports of speeches and sermons extracted from a newspaper.

In Mr. Harness's Sermons (Moxon) there is much that is sensible and useful, and "calculated for being read aloud in families," which he proposes as his object in publishing. When, however, he calls the Church "a party," p. 81, and the Lord's day "the Sabbath," p. 272, he shows himself tainted with the religious peculiarisms of the day. Nothing is more common in every age than sacrificing one part of Christian truth to another; or buying off general strictness of life by attention to one particular duty. At present this temper shows itself in endeavouring, by laying a stress on the duty of sanctifying a seventh of our time, to make up for the neglect of all other positive ordinances, such as the Apostolical Succession, Church Communion, the Priesthood, Sacramental Grace, and Tithes and Offerings. We do not mean to include Mr. Harness in this censure, but are speaking of the system to which he has in one point given in. It is this circumstance which makes Sabbath Societies, Sabbath Bills, &c. so *hypocritical*, if we may use the word; "these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the others undone."

Mr. Bennett's Sermons (Cleaver) are not to be confounded with the run of such publications at this day, than which nothing can be more feeble. They are the composition of an able and thoughtful mind, and contain earnest and practical remarks, clothed in plain and natural language. However, they are not written as if he had a clear and consistent grasp of the truth. We do not mention as more than symbols of what we mean, that he, too, calls the Lord's day the Sabbath, that he confuses together the Catholic and Sectarian ascetics of the Primitive ages, and quotes Doddridge and Chrysostom in the same Sermon.

Mr. Fulford's Course of Plain Sermons on the Ministry, Doctrines, and Services of our Church (Rivingtons), are among the pleasing evidences of the growth of sound Catholic principles among what are called "the working Clergy." Here is a laborious parish priest, showing that it is possible to stand his ground in a mixed population without sacrificing principle. His Sermons contain a good deal of sound matter in a small space.

Mr. Vogan, known already by his Bampton Lectures, has published five sound and useful Sermons, apparently as a companion to them.

Mr. Poole's Testimony of St. Cyprian against Rome is a careful and perspicuous Essay, showing that Rome is not legitimately what she claims to be,

"the Mother and Mistress of all Churches." He considers that, in St. Cyprian's judgment, St. Peter was a symbol and not the instrument of unity, that all bishops are such instruments, and are what St. Peter typified; that Rome, as being the *sedes Petri*, has a natural primacy of honour and of deference in faith and practice among the Churches, not a power of jurisdiction; that over those Churches, which trace their orders to Rome, she is in some sense the instrument of unity as being the witness of the truth, but loses her privilege when and so far as she declines from the truth. Mr. Poole will allow us to ask why he says "Peter" instead of "St. Peter;" the usage of Latin and Greek divinity is no authority; give us back the early ages and we can dispense with such ceremonial observances; but in times when irreverence is rife, we must make up for what we have lost as we may; and this is one of those means which remains to us of preserving a tone of mind which the world would fain take from us.

Mr. Cape, B.A., of Balliol College, Oxford, has added to an "Inquiry into the Use of Church Authority, &c." a catena of English Divines, "who have regarded Scripture as the *only test* of the divine will," and thereby incurred an *ignoratio elenchi* in the controversy in which he engages; the point in dispute being, whether, in *interpreting* that "only test" as regards matters of faith, an individual is to be guided by his own private judgment or by Catholic tradition. However, we highly approve of the principle of such undertakings; and though we think his to be defective, both as regards the point to be proved, and testimonies to prove it, we desire nothing better than to see others of the same kind. Let us know *how* and *where* English divines stand by all means. The persons he opposes have too much candour to aim at making the body of our divines more consistent than they really are, or at appropriating a Chillingworth and a Whitby, or even a Hall and a Cranmer. At the same time we feel assured, that at the end of the examination, those writers among our divines "whom all the people count as prophets," those whom they read and consult, know and revere, will not be found with Mr. Cape.

The Third Part of Mr. Girdlestone's Commentary on the Old Testament (from Joshua to Samuel), has been published; and to judge from the portions we have read, contains much sensible and useful application of the sacred narrative.

Mr. Lathbury's State of Popery and Jesuitism in England, forms a useful volume of reference for the series of historical events, connected with the subject, since the Reformation; but we fear we must say we agree in opinion with scarce a page of it.

We are glad to observe that Mr. Knox's Treatises on the Sacrament are published (Duncan) in one small volume. So original a thinker as Mr.

Knox, and with such deficient opportunities of instruction in the full "deposition" of faith, cannot of course be unreservedly recommended. But we believe this highly-gifted and religious man to be an instrument (if it is right so to speak) in the hands of Providence, of extensive good in the Church at this moment; and we are sure that, even granting he might mislead if followed *exclusively*, he will be found to impart most valuable information, and to suggest many deep, important, and practical views on a variety of subjects.

We invite attention to an Abridgment, just published, of Bishop Hall's "Episcopacy by Divine Right asserted" (Hatchard). The Bishop's name stands so high with a large portion of the religious public, and is so respected by all, that the republication of this Treatise promises to be very useful at this moment.

Another very important publication is that of Leslie's Case of the Regale and Pontificate (Leslie, Great Queen Street). All persons who have their minds to make up on the subject of Church and State, should study this celebrated work of one of the clearest and most powerful of our Divines.

It is encouraging to witness so many reprints of specimens of our standard theological and devotional works. A third reprint, which needs no notice of ours to recommend it, is Bishop Cosin's Devotions for the Hours of Prayer. It both indicates and, we trust, will further the growth of a devotional temper among us.

And another valuable reprint is a small Tract of the beginning of the last century, called *Pietas Loudinensis* (Burns); from which it appears that at that time there were daily prayers in no fewer than seventy-one London churches and chapels.

In connection with this last subject may be mentioned a most cheering occurrence, the re-opening of Lincoln's-Inn Chapel for daily service; on occasion of which an excellent Sermon, since published, was preached by the Rev. R. W. Browne, Assistant Preacher and Classical Professor in King's College, which deserves attention, both from its contents and the reputation of its author.

Mr. Irons, a young clergyman of great promise, has published a second series of Parochial Lectures, which, besides their intrinsic excellence, exhibits an additional instance how mistaken the common idea is, that the recent spread of Church doctrines is connected with any one place or set of persons, instead of being, as it is, *the necessary effect of increased theological reading*. In the case of the clergy this effect *must* follow, if they are honest, or a necessity of retiring from their existing engagements. Mr. Irons observes, in his

Preface, that his religious views, which are in accordance with those of the first ages, were formed quite independently of those sources to which the present improved tone concerning Church doctrine is commonly ascribed.

Mr. Coxe, of St. James's, has published an impressive Charity Sermon, under the title of "The Lowly Station dignified." Nothing can convey more strikingly the low standard of religious knowledge and principle in the Metropolis, than to find from the author's preface that so unexceptionable a composition has been accused of being too political and too high Church.

We are in expectation of two interesting works by Mr. Wigram, "The Schoolmaster's Manual," which is a collection of Practical Hints for the information of National Schoolmasters; and "Occasional Papers," on the same subject. The intimate knowledge of his subject, which Mr. Wigram's situation as Secretary to the National Society gives him, will add great weight to his opinion.

Dr. Hook, of Leeds, has published a carefully considered Tract on the Athanasian Creed: in which he has shown the coincidence between it and Scripture on the doctrines which it expounds. A controversy has arisen in his neighbourhood about some of those points of doctrine which are now so generally under discussion. The Rev. Miles Jackson opened the controversy with an attack on Dr. Hook, on the ground that persons in Oxford had written Tracts which Mr. Jackson considered Popish; and which Dr. Hook approved, so far as he considered them not Popish but Anglican. In an unassuming and effective Pamphlet Mr. Ward, of Leeds, has shown that the several propositions, gathered from the Tracts by Mr. Jackson, in favour of baptismal regeneration, &c. &c., are all held by Bishop Jeremy Taylor, whom Mr. Jackson had spoken of as "a very Shakspeare in divinity," an authority "to which it would be fatal to stand conspicuously opposed." Mr. Poole has published a learned answer to the same charges, in which he clears up the misrepresentations and sophistry on which such statements are commonly based. From the same place has appeared an Appeal on the Doctrines of Sacramental Efficacy, Apostolical Succession, and Church and State, by a Dissenting Minister named Ely. Of him we know nothing; but we are bound to state that he writes in a subdued and thoughtful spirit (though, of course, with most erroneous views of the Gospel), and far surpasses any pamphlet on the same side which has proceeded from Churchmen.

We have to thank Mr. Pratt, of Cruden, for Three excellent Sermons on Scottish Episcopacy. It being very important to circulate information in England concerning our deeply injured sister Church, we are glad to be able to refer our readers to any publications, like the present, which are devoted to that object. Mr. Ramsay has published his Sermon preached at the con-

secration of the Bishop of Glasgow and the Bishop (assistant) of Brechin. It is one of those testimonies to the doctrine of the divine origin and privileges of the Church, which are now happily so common.

Several interesting publications have reached us from Burlington (New Jersey). Bishop Doane's eloquent Sermon at the Ordination of Mr. Wolff; the Journal of the Fifty-fourth Annual Convention of the Church over which he presides; and Translations of the Epistles of Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp.

The importance of the Christian Knowledge Society makes it necessary to attend to their proceedings in proportion as it is painful to do so; for this reason, we subjoin the following short account of what has taken place in the last several monthly meetings. A few months ago Mr. Clarke brought forward a motion, the purport of which was to expunge from the list all the tracts which had been suffered to go out of print within a certain period. The feeling of the meeting was strongly against this resolution; when Dr. Russell moved, as an amendment, "that all tracts which at any time shall have been out of print for *five* years shall be considered as no longer on the list." This was carried.

A more injurious regulation cannot well be conceived, since it obviously tends to destroy the *permanency* of the character of the tracts; *e. g.* if any subject should not excite attention for a few years, and the tracts relating to it go out of print, the lovers of old opinions will be placed under the disadvantage of having to get new tracts on the list, instead of having merely to revive the old ones already there. There would be no hope in this day of getting on the list a tract entitled "*The Christian Sacrifice*;" Nelson's, to wit.

At the April meeting, Dr. Spry brought forward a resolution to the effect that it shall not be lawful for any member to furnish to any newspaper a report of the discussions which took place at the Board. An amendment was moved by Mr. Tyler, extending the prohibition to all periodical publications. This was carried in a very large meeting, about two-thirds of the members present supporting it.

At the meeting in May, a Report from the Standing Committee was taken into consideration; the purport of which was to recommend "that the Tract Committee should be empowered, with the approbation of the Episcopal Referees, to place Books and Tracts on the Society's Catalogue." The object of this resolution was to get rid of the unseemliness of taking a ballot in the general meeting on the admission of tracts, which had already received the sanction of the five Bishops. The recommendation of the Standing Committee was adopted, 210 members voting in its favour, and 65 against it.

Notwithstanding the resolution passed in May, the "Record" newspaper continued to report the discussions; this being noticed at the meeting, Mr. Gordon, on June 5th, moved "that the resolution entered upon the minutes of

the April meeting in regard to the non-publication of reports of any discussions which take place at the meeting of this board is altogether null and void."

Mr. Gordon's resolution was discussed and negatived, by a majority of about 2 to 1.

In the course of these meetings much miserable wrangling, much boisterousness and unseemly confusion occurred: such exhibitions are, unhappily, no novelty now in the Society; but what is a novelty, and demands serious notice, is the introduction of the principle of parliamentary divisions. It was once the aim of the Society to pass every thing without division at all, even by showing of hands. Then division was only called for when the decision was doubtful; but now it is called for the purpose of showing *the strength of parties*, an object altogether inconsistent with the character of such a meeting.

THE
BRITISH CRITIC,
AND
Quarterly Theological Review.

OCTOBER, 1838.

ART. I.—*The Life of William Wilberforce.* By his Sons, Robert Isaac Wilberforce, M.A. Vicar of East Farleigh, late Fellow of Oriel College; and Samuel Wilberforce, M.A. Rector of Brighthelmston. 5 vols. London: Murray. 1838.

THE times are gone by, probably never to return, when monks stepped forth from the cloister to direct the counsels of mighty sovereigns, and to wield the secular destinies of Christendom. And little enough is the complacency with which men now look back to the days of frocked and cowled statesmen; for, scarcely can they endure the sight even of mitred legislators! And yet—(in spite of all this universal revulsion against the phenomena which, in former generations, were often witnessed in the high places of the earth)—we profess ourselves unable to look without something of a profound interest upon one particular aspect which those appearances present. During the *darker* ages,—(as it is the pleasure of our wise men to call them),—Religion was not held inherently unfit to stand at the helm, when the goodly vessel of the commonwealth was tempest-tossed, and close upon the breakers. It is true that there may always have been danger in admitting Piety to much discourse with worldly Ambition; seeing that Ambition might be more apt to transform Piety from what she is, to an idolatress, than Piety to convert Ambition to her own likeness. Still, it was something that, in those times, Religion and Statesmanship were not regarded as utterly *dissociable* and incongruous things. To the men of those generations, there was nothing extravagant or inappropriate in the combination of a profession of sanctity with the arduous responsibilities of empire. It was never imagined that a faithful devotion to the service of God must, of necessity, disqualify any one for the vigorous and intelligent discharge of duties connected with the temporal interests of man. And we can scarcely prevail on ourselves to doubt, that when nations beheld their fortunes entrusted to the guidance

of men whose vocation dedicated them to God, they were thereby kept in remembrance of that, which now seems to have well nigh fallen into oblivion,—even that the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth, and that He alone is the Sovereign of all the kingdoms of the earth. The individual Churchman, exalted to political station, might sometimes chance to be, personally, rapacious, proud, and corrupt. But, still, he was the visible image and representative of a grand and sacred general principle,—namely, that earthly power is never so venerable or so commanding, as when it appears in close alliance with the mightiest influences of holiness.

For instance,—let us only think, for a moment, of such a man as Ximenes. Behold him, robed in the splendour of official greatness. And then, draw aside this gorgeous disguise, and see the shirt of penance in perpetual contact with his flesh. Observe his keen eye, his capacious forehead, and his majestic brow. And, then, peruse his countenance, at once furrowed with the cares of state, and sharp with the austerities of a mortified and self-denying life. Contemplate the man, whose ever-wakeful sense of his sacred calling might place him among the foremost of the saints; while his mastery in the arts of administration and of government might send all ordinary statesmen to school. And, then, consider,—was it possible, with an example like this before their eyes, for worldlings, and for Sybarites, and for traffickers and jobbers in the political exchange, to proclaim that, truly, the atmosphere of religion was one in which the wisdom that rules the earth must, always, be unable to respire; that the cell, or the cloister, or the manse, are the only proper habitation for the spirit of devotion; and that, if it were to intrude itself into the cabinets of princes, we should have nothing to look for, but mutilated energies and infatuated counsels? And was not something substantial gained to the greatest of all causes, by these august and visible proofs, that a man may be serviceable to his country, without forgetting his Saviour and his God?

The picture is one, upon the like of which we shall never look again. And, while we are pointing to it, we are prepared for the reply,—that, after all, the man was a monk and an inquisitor! And, in truth, we are far enough from contending that, in the present state of the world, it could be at all desirable to confound together the functions of the ecclesiastic and the politician. Neither are we maintaining, that, at any time, the cloister is the fittest place of training for the cabinet or the senate. But, nevertheless, in contemplating the loftiest eminences of life, at the present day, one cannot well avoid being struck with the prodigious contrast, which forces itself on our notice, between the practices of those *dark* times, and the habits of thought which distinguish this, our

age of light. At present, scarcely one man in a myriad ever thinks of looking for deep-seated religion in a statesman, or a politician. We look, indeed, for integrity, and honour, and magnanimity, and inflexible steadfastness of purpose; and, even for these we, too often, look in vain. But, as for exalted piety, or strict sanctity of life,—we scarcely more expect it, than the valet of the Premier expects to find the sackcloth, or the monkish girdle, beneath the fine linen of his Right Honourable master. And, if at any time, so strange a phenomenon should occur, as an earnest profession of piety in a great public character, the probability is, that, instead of being welcomed as a source of strength, it would only be deplored, or scorned, as an indication of weakness. What,—it might be asked,—has a priest-ridden conscience to do in the council-chamber, or the senate? What is to become of us all, if the laboratory of legislation is to be converted into one vast scruple-shop? The man has, most certainly, mistaken his vocation. He might have made a decent sort of prebendary enough; or, perhaps, a very tolerable bishop. But he is sadly out of place among lawgivers and statesmen!

This, however, is not all. A profound sense of Christian responsibility seems, to a fearful extent, to have become obsolete, not only in the region of politics, but almost throughout the whole compass of our aristocracy; the aristocracy of Rank,—the aristocracy of Wealth,—the aristocracy of Intellect. In venturing on this sweeping statement, we must, of course, be understood to speak with a due regard to many glorious and gratifying exceptions,—more in number than can be duly estimated by any, but by Him who seeth in secret, and shall reward openly. We speak, mainly, with reference to the general tone of manner and of feeling, in the exalted regions of the community. And, there, we do find that religion is too much regarded as an attribute which great folks may very well contrive to do without: and that, when it does appear, it often involves something like a loss of caste,—a partial excommunication from the pale of *good society*. Its restraints are, there, but little felt in the hour of prosperity, and its consolations but very partially known in the season of adversity. It is either forgotten altogether; or, if remembered at all, it is apt to appear with the terrors of the fabled head, which looked the beholder to marble. If it escapes contempt, or apathy, it will probably be dreaded as an austere, ungenial influence, which kills the young heart of gaiety and blithesomeness; and, in manhood, freezes the current of all generous and useful energy. And hence it is that the high and brilliant world is provided with good store of nick-names, by which religion may be proscribed from all chance of a cordial reception. Enthusiasm—fanaticism—pusil-

lanimity—hypocrisy,—these are among the “ brave words” which are perpetually on the lips of the towering leaders, or the abject followers, in the world of power, of fashion, and of intellect. And excellent is the service which these phrases are found to do, in behalf of those who aspire to be thought superior to the feebleness and prejudice of ordinary minds. And the result has been, that an awful desecration has come upon a large and elevated region of society; to the inexpressible injury of those who are more humbly placed. For, it can scarcely be expected that the poor will escape some temptation to doubt, whether religion can be the one thing needful for them, so long as their betters appear to regard it as the one thing needless or superfluous for themselves; or, at least, as a thing of which their betters may take just as much, or just as little, as may chance to suit their convenience, or their taste.

In a state of things like this, what mortal tongue can do fitting honour to the man, who should stand forward, in the face of the world, and lift up his testimony against this foul degeneracy of Christian men? What words can do justice to him, who should,—not only by his own personal walk and conversation, show how very possible it is to be a faithful and energetic public man, without ceasing to be a lowly and watchful soldier of the cross,—but, who should, likewise, make nearly the whole of a long life one continuous protest against the folly and the madness of doubting that possibility? What shall we say of one, who, for a long course of years, regardless of contempt and obloquy, persisted in the discharge of his baptismal vow; and declared,—in the world of statesmen, and of nobles, and of adventurers in the secular strife for masteries,—that the knowledge of Christ, and him crucified, was, after all, the only knowledge really worth the pursuit of any reasoning man? What shall we say of one, who, while toiling in the furnace of political contention, yet had no hurt, neither was a hair of his head singed, neither were his garments changed, nor the smell of the fire had passed upon him? Now, whatever great and glorious things may be said of such a man, may, nearly to the letter, be said of William Wilberforce. It is true, that Wilberforce was, himself, no statesman. But, he lived perpetually in the midst of statesmen. He moved and had his being in the region, where are forged the thunder and the lightning which shake, and which terrify, the place beneath. And there was he, for the most part, to be seen, in the calm and almost sinless peace which denotes a member of the City of the Living God. It would have been no small thing to say that he was born to the sphere, in which such “ fantastic tricks are played before high heaven” by them who seem to “ have the world as

their confectionary ;” by them, who look upon it as their rightful inheritance to hold

—the eyes, the ears, the tongues, and hearts of men

At duty, more than they can frame employment ;

and further, that he was bred to a familiarity with the tree, the fruits of which are pleasant to the eye, and which seem much to be desired to make one wise ; and yet, that neither Wealth nor Literature could speak to him, as they speak to so many others, with the voice of the tempter, proclaiming—*Ye shall be as Gods!* It would have been no small thing to say thus much of any man. But, noble as this praise might be, it would do but scanty justice to the name of Wilberforce. His most eminent and palmary commendation is, that, even while walking in the labyrinth of statecraft, he never lost the clue which guideth to a better country ; that he made the walls of the legislature to ring with his faithful and courageous testimony to the Truth ; that the false wisdom of the hustings or the court could never rase out from his heart the awful saying,—Whosoever shall deny Me before men, him shall the Son of Man also deny before the angels of God !

The man of whom thus much can be affirmed, has won an immortality which heroes, and politicians, and patriots may well envy. If nothing more could be said of him, this would alone make good his title to a sepulchre in the midst of our most honoured and illustrious dead. He has ceased from his labours, and his works will, doubtless, follow him. The latest posterity shall bless his name on earth ; and the souls, which his example and his writings have helped to save, shall bear witness for him, before all the company of heaven. He shall, there, surely, find that he has a name better even than that of sons and daughters ; that he has a long succession of spiritual inheritors, written on the roll of that bright genealogy, which the Seraphim shall look upon with delight and joy. In the mean time, it is not wonderful that all who honoured and loved him while he was yet in the flesh, should be impatient for a faithful record of his trials and his victories. And such a record, the hand of filial affection has now prepared for us.

It is our purpose to give but a brief and rapid outline of this pregnant history. In this province of our office, contemporary publications have been beforehand with us. We, accordingly, may spare ourselves the labour, and our readers the weariness, attendant upon a very copious abstract of his biography. Our endeavour shall be to seize the points which are most striking and momentous, with reference to his influence on the higher interests of human society. The public are already aware that his parentage was of the highest respectability. We find, among his

ancestors, the stately name of Ilgerus de Wilberfoss, who served in the Scottish wars, under Philip de Kyme, and who intermarried with a daughter of that same powerful house. His grandfather, (who first adopted the modern orthography of the name), was a man of ample property, and of much repute for talent and integrity, among his fellow-townsmen at Hull; at which place William Wilberforce was born, August 24, 1759. His frame in childhood was extremely feeble. But his mind was vigorous and active, and his temper singularly tender and affectionate. His sense of religion manifested itself, in his boyhood, with a degree of seriousness which seems to have alarmed his friends; for they, straightway, came to the rescue, and called in the aid of gaiety and self-indulgence. Their views were potently furthered by the festive and genial spirit at that time predominant in the society of Hull. Under this fostering care, his social aptitudes sprung up into very promising development; and his rare skill in singing made him a welcome guest in every mirthful company. At the age of fourteen, though still much immersed in frivolity and pleasure, he was smitten with a profound detestation for the slave-trade; and vented his indignation and disgust in a letter to the editor of the York newspaper. In October, 1776, he was removed from school to St. John's College, Cambridge; his reminiscences of which are by no means eminently honourable to that Body. We pass them over, however, in the hope and belief that the persons whom he chanced to fall in with, were not fair specimens of the learned society in question. All this time, it would appear that there was an under-current of deeper feeling, beneath the gay and laughing ripple of his outward and superficial life: for, he sacrificed, for a season, the convenience of a degree to certain conscientious scruples touching subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles. These misgivings he conquered by subsequent inquiry; but, at that time, was inflexibly resolved to withhold his concurrence from dogmas which he had not thoroughly examined.

The early portion of his political life is sufficiently well known;—his opposition to Lord North;—his close and familiar intimacy with Pitt;—his foreign travel with that youthful prodigy of statesmanship;—his election for Hull,—and, subsequently, for Yorkshire. At this period, he was assailed by the combined seductions of ambition and of pleasure; and, as yet, he had not buckled on the armour by which alone they could be successfully resisted. His eloquence and talent opened to him the brightest prospects of political eminence. His delightful easiness of temper, his winning frankness and vivacity, and his variety of pleasing accomplishment, floated him, easily and pleasantly, into the most

enchanting scenes of dissipation. And his abundant fortune invited him to an unreserved enjoyment of these perilous *advantages*. There was enough of delicacy and refinement in his nature to repel the grosser pollutions of a licentious life. But, of high-wrought luxury, he confesses that he took his fill. He was a member of five distinguished Clubs, at each of which the style of living was prodigal and elaborate. He was, even, very near being drawn in by the Mælstrom of the gambling-table; and was awakened from that dreadful infatuation only by the remorse excited by his own good fortune, which, on one occasion, sent him home laden with £600,—the spoil of certain youthful patricians, who could ill afford to be plundered to that amount. His vocal talents recommended him to the Prince. His powers of mimicry increased the circle of his admirers. But, of this last dangerous habit he was happily cured by the caustic remark of the veteran Chancellor, Lord Camden, who pronounced that mimicry, after all, was but a vulgar accomplishment; and who positively refused to be present, when invited to witness the proficiency of Wilberforce.

Hitherto, then, the religious principle within him had given but faint and dubious signs of life. It was not dead. But its slumbers were deep enough to save him from severe and frequent molestation. The sleeper was awakened by what most men would call an accident, but what Wilberforce, more fitly, spoke of as a providence. In 1784, he was anxious to find a companion in a continental tour. He applied to his friend, Mr. W. Burgh. To his surprise, the offer was declined. It appears, by the event, that, if we may so express it, the vacancy had been kept for another. At Scarborough he chanced to meet with Isaac Milner, the brother of the Schoolmaster and Ecclesiastical Historian. The well-stored mind and masculine good sense of Milner seemed to point him out as the person of all others the most to be desired for the purpose. The invitation was given and accepted. But, as the biographers observe, "little could either party then imagine the gracious purpose for which this choice was ordered." The depth of Milner's principles was, then, unknown to Wilberforce; who confesses, broadly, that an earlier knowledge of them would certainly have prevented the engagement. Strange as it may seem, the secret convictions of Milner had, then, merely a theoretical existence. At least, no virtue went forth from them, to influence his outward walk and conversation. He appeared, at that time, as an ordinary man of the world. He mixed in all companies; and joined, as readily as others, in the prevalent Sunday parties. The first intimation of his views was conveyed in his reply to a remark of Wilberforce,

relative to a clergyman of the name of Stillingfleet, whom he (Wilberforce) described as a good man, but one who carried things too far. "Not a bit too far"—said Milner: and this opinion he stoutly maintained in a subsequent conversation. This led to discussion; and, at last, to a proposal, on Milner's part, that they should take Doddridge's *Rise and Progress of Religion* with them, and read it on their journey. The result was, that Wilberforce resolved, at some future time, to examine the Scriptures for himself.

The convenient season, however, did not immediately arrive. On his return to England, he was, once more, in the giddy whirl of fashion. He dined three times a week with Pitt—joined Harry Dundas in the joyous festivities of Wimbledon and Richmond—sat up all night singing—shirked the Duchess of Gordon at Almack's—and danced till five in the morning! But the crisis was now at hand. In the summer of 1785, he resumed his travels, and his discussions, with Isaac Milner. They went through the Greek Testament. They carefully examined its doctrines. They conversed, and they investigated: till, at length, he returned home, "another man, in his inward being, though manifesting outwardly but little of the hidden struggle." It is evident, from his own retrospect of this important period, that the fire had, all along, been shut up in his bones, although, for the most part, in a *latent* condition. Sometimes, indeed, the vivid element would make itself felt. "Often"—he says—"while in the full enjoyment of all that this world could bestow, my conscience told me that, in the true sense of the word, I was not a Christian. I laughed, I sung, I was apparently gay and happy. But the thought would steal across me—what madness is all this; to continue easy in a state when a sudden call out of this world would consign me to everlasting misery; and that, when eternal happiness is within my grasp." And yet—"it was not so much"—he has said—"the fear of punishment by which I was affected, as a sense of my great sinfulness, in having so long neglected the unspeakable mercies of my God and Saviour. And such was the effect which this thought produced, that, for months, I was in a state of the deepest depression, from strong convictions of my guilt. Indeed, nothing which I have ever read, in the accounts of others, exceeded what I then felt."

The path which now lay before him was sufficiently perplexed and rugged. While he was, himself, an altered man, the friends of his youth continued unchanged around him, and utterly unsuspecting of his defection from the service in which they were still very contentedly engaged. In order, therefore, to make his way clearer and more direct, he found it expedient distinctly to

announce to his former intimates, and to Pitt among the rest, the revolution which his own principles had recently undergone. The reception which these communications met with would be amusing enough, if they did not exhibit the *children of this world* under an aspect too melancholy to be contemplated without pain. Some treated the whole merely as an indication of temporary depression. One actually threw his letter into the fire. Others there were, who knew that his life, though often frivolous and dissipated, was never positively vicious. And these persons instantly concluded that nothing could possibly remain for him but to turn *ascetic*; a proceeding which they exceedingly regretted, seeing that it would inflict upon themselves the loss of his social accomplishments and political assistance. Pitt was among those who thought that his poor friend must be out of spirits; and, accordingly, prescribed the never-failing specific of social intercourse and animating conversation. But Wilberforce was not so easily to be put aside. He sought and obtained an interview with Pitt, and grappled with him for two hours. The statesman laboured vigorously to reason the convert out of his convictions. But the cause was too hard for him. He found himself unable to combat the correctness of these impressions,—*provided always that Christianity were true!* Whether it were true or not, was a question, which had, probably, never engaged the serious and sustained attention of the youthful patriot. From boyhood, his whole faculties were absorbed in his own lofty, but bewildering, vocation. It seems, however, that he *had* read the work of Bishop Butler: and the state of his mind may be pretty clearly discerned from the declaration he then made, that this celebrated treatise had raised in his mind more doubts than it had answered. We are not greatly surprised at this. The *Analogy* of Butler is, doubtless, a glorious and immortal work; this mightiest of Vindication. But, still we do not very well see how any man is to make much progress towards mastery in divine truth, if he studies nothing but merely its defensive resources. The grand maxim, after all, is this—he that is desirous, and resolute, to do the will of God, shall know, of the doctrine whether it be of God. If this maxim be forgotten, or disregarded, evidences and analogies, it is to be feared, may be pored over to little purpose. If we would obtain any adequate perception of the beauty and majesty of truth, we should look upwards to her citadel and her sanctuary, instead of creeping for ever about her outworks and her bastions.

It was during the agony of his internal conflict, that Wilberforce commenced the practice of registering, more or less copiously, in a private Journal, all the vicissitudes which befel his inward man,—all the ebbings and flowings of devotional feeling,

—the sunshine and the shadow—the rising or the falling temperature—in short, the whole phenomena of his own spiritual meteorology. Of this practice, it would be idle to speak in general and sweeping terms, either of censure or of approbation. Its effects must depend a good deal upon the peculiar constitution of the individual. It has been said that he who is his own lawyer, is sure to have a fool for his client; and that he who is his own physician is equally sure to have a fool for his patient. These maxims, of course, must be understood and applied in a spirit of reasonable and cautious limitation. And, in that same spirit, we may, at least, venture to say, that it is not every man who is quite fit to be his own confessor. The habit of observing and recording every secret symptom,—the anxious and constant manipulation of the moral pulse,—the incessant watching of the gradations of vitality,—all these are likely enough, in some cases, to bring on a low, morbid, and nervous state of feeling. They may chance to keep the mind, if we may venture on the phrase, in a state of religious *fidget*. Or, they may convert the man of “*aspin conscience*” into an hypochondriac self-tormenter, a sort of *malade imaginaire*. With some, they may end in a condition of unearthly mysticism and abstraction. With others, on the contrary, they may operate something after the manner of a course of cordial waters, to which the patient has the very dangerous power of helping himself, *ad libitum*. Instances are, doubtless, to be found, in which the practice in question may have been useful and salutary enough. And such, we are disposed to believe, was the case with Wilberforce. His Journal was, to him, a species of sanctuary, to which he could, at any time, retreat from the stunning and bewildering din of worldly strife. It was like the ear of a familiar friend, of undoubted fidelity and secrecy, into which he could pour out, without reserve, all the secrets of his heart. The stamina of his mind were too sound, and his faculties too highly disciplined and cultivated, to leave him much enfeebled or disordered by indulgence in the somewhat dangerous luxury of self-communion. And his perpetual contact with the stirring world around him, would act as an effectual corrective to the propensity towards spiritual caprices and imaginings. His own object was to keep his heart in a state of humility and watchfulness. And, for this purpose, we question not that he may have found an useful auxiliary in his Journal.

But, whatever may be the uses, or abuses, of a religious Diary, a very grave question indeed may arise, respecting the propriety of publishing to the world any such collection of private memoranda. By some, it has been contended that these written soliloquies ought to be held as sacred as the secrets of the confessional:

and, that to make them public—at least without the express consent of the writer—is utterly indefensible. By others, it is maintained that serious injury may be inflicted upon society by large disclosures of this nature. The example, it is said, must have a tendency to deluge the world with a vast influx of worthless, and perhaps pernicious, musings and meditations. Many weak brethren, and some false brethren, may be tempted by it, to think of building up a reputation for sanctity out of no better materials than the miserable fragments of thought, which they are pleased to dignify with the title of *communings with their own heart*. The weak enthusiast, the self-conceited spiritual sentimentalist, and possibly the double-minded adventurer in religion—half devotee, half hypocrite—all these, it is apprehended, may chance, in their turn, to be set up as models for imitation. And thus, the healthful tone of religious principle and feeling may be exposed to the most serious injury; and, in many instances, may be almost incurably vitiated.

We cannot say that we are quite so awfully smitten with these scruples and alarms, as certain of our contemporaries. We are by no means prepared to affirm that no case can possibly occur in which the publication of such private records might be honestly, safely, and judiciously, hazarded. Thus much, however, will doubtless be universally allowed,—that too much delicacy and caution cannot well be exercised by those who have such documents at their disposal. With regard to the *Journal of Wilberforce*, the chief fault to be found with it, is, that, for the most part, it is terribly monotonous. Day after day, month after month, year after year, we have all the permutations and combinations, which could possibly be formed out of a given number of notes, perpetually iterated; and, we must candidly avow, that the effect, upon the whole, is dull and wearisome. It must be almost needless for us to declare that, in saying this, we mean to utter nothing disrespectful to the memory of the journalizer; nothing in disparagement of his profound sincerity and singleness of heart; nothing which may cast contempt or slight upon the struggles and the exercises, through which he passed to his reward. But, it is absolutely impossible that the daily spiritual experiences of any long life, should be otherwise than tedious, unless the individual should chance to be distinguished by some startling originality of character, or, his internal history should be marked by a series of heart-stirring vicissitudes and trials. The *Confessions of Augustine*—for instance—must be interesting, to the end of time. His early entanglement in the monstrous errors of the Manichees—his flounderings and buffetings through the conflicting elements of the heathen philosophy—his long servitude

to the lower passions of our nature—the tender and untiring solicitude with which his mother watched him throughout all the dangerous windings of his course—the reply of the bishop, whom she had wearied with the outpouring of her sorrows and her fears, “Woman, go in peace; it is not possible that the child of so many tears should perish”—and, finally, the planting of his footsteps on the steep and narrow way that leadeth unto life,—all these, and such as these, are matters which at once enchain the attention and edify the spirit. The autobiography of Baxter, again, is, in many respects, most valuable and instructive; and, more especially so, because it shows us that one of the last acquirements of a mature Christian, is the habit of resting chiefly on the prime, simple, and fundamental verities of Revelation, and a growing distaste for matters of merely *doubtful disputation*. But the spiritual life of Wilberforce abounds with no “disastrous chances,” no “perilous accidents,” no “hair-breadth scapes.” Neither does the chronicle exhibit much power of mind, or rich originality of thought. The history of his progress is poor in materials. When once he had torn to pieces the silken net which hung about his youth, the miseries of his captivity were at an end. Like other Christian men, indeed, he had still an internal warfare to undergo. But, it was a warfare which, though sometimes formidable and harassing enough, was marked by no striking variety of adventure. And hence, whatever is to be learned from it, may be nearly as well learned from the perusal of any score of pages taken at random, as from a careful study of it from beginning to end. All this may, doubtless, have been a happiness for him. But it is not a happiness for them who have to follow him throughout all the stages of his pilgrimage. We are, therefore, almost tempted to wish that his biographers could have satisfied their sense of duty by a much less prodigal exhibition of the contents of his Journal. It might, we do think, have been well, if they had simply stated, as a fact, once for all, that he was in the habit of noting down the results of his daily self-examination; and, then, had been content with producing, occasionally, the more important and remarkable specimens of the voluminous record. By this procedure, it is true, the work must have been reduced to about one half of its present size; and grievous disappointment might thereby have been inflicted on a numerous class of readers, who would have bitterly deplored that a word or a syllable of his should have been lost. It is scarcely surprising, therefore, that the biographers should be unwilling to take upon themselves the responsibility of selection, or suppression. They were, very naturally and amiably, anxious that their father’s character should bear, with its whole influence, upon Christian

society; and, accordingly, they dared not to trust themselves with the exercise of a discretion, which might possibly have shorn it of some element of power.

But, to proceed with the main narrative. The change that had passed upon the mind of Wilberforce, was, finally, proclaimed to the world, by his secession from all the clubs of which he was a member; "a precaution which he thought to be essential to his safety, in the critical circumstances in which he was placed." From that time, his public life was principally devoted to three objects; the discharge of his parliamentary duties—the improvement of his country in morals and religion—and the abolition of the slave-trade. We gladly leave to others the office of tracing him throughout the whole of his political course. We shall content ourselves with remarking that he utterly abjured the character of a party man. He placed himself in the position of an independent member: a sort of anomaly which, under the peculiar form of our constitution, is seldom regarded with much confidence or favour. In conformity with this resolution to keep his conscience and his judgment unfettered, he opposed the revolution war—for a time, was alienated from Pitt—incurred the displeasure of his friends—and, once, was openly *cut* by the King. By this renunciation of the ties which usually bind public men together, he brought upon himself the sarcastic commendation, that "you might always be sure of Wilberforce—*when you did not want him!*" He was, probably, but little disturbed by the dispersion of *voces ambiguae* like these. Votes are, generally, most *wanted*, when some very questionable object is to be obtained. And these were, precisely, the occasions on which it was to be expected that a *truly* independent man would be most likely to fail his political friends, and thus expose himself to the charge of cowardly or treacherous defection. In spite of all such insinuations and reproaches, he held on his course; with what degree of judgment, we leave others to decide; but, doubtless, with an unsullied and self-approving conscience. How the business of a constitutional government, under a limited monarchy, could be carried on, if every member of the legislature were thus to consider himself as a free, disengaged, unconnected unit, is a problem which we cannot take upon ourselves to solve. And, we are the less solicitous about it, because the solution is not likely to be very soon required. In the mean time, the political world, we trust, is not likely to suffer much from an occasional example of inflexible integrity. The desperate, unflinching, unreasoning fidelity of party men, is an affair of every day's occurrence. And, whatever may be the necessity for it, it is impossible to witness, without grief and shame, the sacrifices frequently demanded

by this relentless and remorseless principle. The contrast to it, presented by the instance of a senator, who acknowledges no supremacy but that of conscience, has, at all events, something about it fitted to ennoble and refresh the heart. It is a spectacle which elevates us to the contemplation of better and purer times than have ever yet been witnessed upon earth.

His efforts for the improvement of the moral and religious character of his countrymen may be speedily enumerated, though it would be no brief matter to follow them out to their full development. His first enterprize was the establishment of a Society for the Reformation of Manners. In the prosecution of this object, he traversed nearly the whole kingdom. He visited many of the bishops. He sought out the most influential of the laymen. For occasional repulses he was habitually prepared: and one of these it is impossible to read of, without unspeakable disgust. "So then, young man,"—said a nobleman, whose house he visited,—“you wish to be a reformer of men’s morals. Look then, and see what is the end of such reformers,”—pointing, as he spoke, to a picture of the crucifixion!—Gracious heaven!—to think that any one should be found in a Christian land, capable of producing the example of the Saviour, for the purpose of *detering* a faithful and zealous follower of the Saviour, from a labour of piety and love! The Society, however, was soon in useful and active operation, and, as the biographers remark, “was the first of those various Associations, which soon succeeded to the apathy of former years.” This effort was, in due time, followed by others of a similar character and tendency;—the Church Missionary Society, in 1797; the attempt to form an Association for the better observance of the Lord’s Day, in 1798; and last, though certainly not least, the British and Foreign Bible Society, in 1803. Of all these enterprizes, Wilberforce may, almost literally, be said to have been the main spring,—the grand moving force: and the publication of his celebrated work on practical Christianity, which appeared in 1797, must, at this period, have armed his name with a most overpowering influence. That book came forth at a period when, to use the words of his friend Mr. Hey, “hell seemed to be broke loose in the most pestiferous doctrines, and most abominable practices, which set the Almighty at defiance, and break the bonds of civil society.” And, we are disposed to agree with his biographers, that the effect of it can scarcely be overrated. Its circulation, they inform us, was, at that time, altogether without precedent. In 1826, fifteen editions had issued from the press in England; some of them very large impressions. In 1807, it was eagerly read in India. In America, the work was imme-

diately reprinted; and, within the same period, twenty-five editions had been sold. It has been translated into the French, Italian, Spanish, Dutch, and German languages. And, beyond all reasonable question, "it gave the first general impulse to that warmer and more earnest spring of piety, which, among its many evils, has happily distinguished the last half-century." While addressed, in the first instance, to his personal acquaintance, it reasoned on the common principles of human nature. It was devotional, not controversial. It spoke the language of no sect or party, but brought out clearly and forcibly the great outlines of the revealed Gospel, contrasting them keenly but soberly with the ordinary practice of the day. It was therefore well fitted, like the *Manual of à Kempis*, to spread throughout the whole church, and call on every side into practical efficiency admitted, though long dormant, principles. Its composition would naturally increase its influence. As a literary work it might be judged to need greater condensation; but its style was the best suited to produce effect. 'I was purposely,' he has said, 'more diffuse than strict taste prescribed, because my object was to make an impression upon men in general.' 'Do not curtail too much,' he once said to a friend, 'portable soup must be diluted before it can be used.' There is in truth throughout the volume a rich and natural eloquence, which wins its way easily with every reader. Its illustrations are happy; its insight into motives clear; and above all, its tone is every where affectionate and earnest. It was seen to be 'the produce of his heart as well as of his understanding.' He addressed his fellow-countrymen moreover from an eminence on which he could be heard; as a layman safe from the imputation of professional bias; and as one who lived in the public eye, and was seen to practise what he taught. He raised indeed a strict, but his own example proved that it was a practicable standard. His life had long been a puzzle to observers. Some had even thought him mad, because they could not comprehend the strange exhibition of his altered habits; but his work supplied the rationale of his conduct, whilst his conduct enforced the precepts of his work. Any one might now examine the staff of the Wizard and learn the secrets of his charmed book."—vol. ii. pp. 203, 204.

So much for this courageous protest against the moral and spiritual degeneracy of the times. With regard to his other exertions in the same cause, it may be questioned whether the good effected was not considerably qualified and lowered by a certain infusion of evil. His close connexion, for instance, with mixed and motley Religious Associations, may have been produc-

tive of some effects which, probably, would have startled and astounded him, if he could distinctly have foreseen them. He was perhaps, not very unnaturally, captivated and seduced by the hope, that force might be accumulated and condensed by the formation of a grand alliance, out of the followers of every imaginable variety of religious belief and discipline. It would be needless and invidious to dwell upon the results of such experiments. Those results have been the subject of much angry and bitter controversy; and we should be unwilling to be visited by the spirit of strife and discord, while contemplating the life and labours of this eminent servant of the Prince of Peace. Thus much, however, we trust, may be said without offence; that,—whether the effect were designed or not,—the employment of miscellaneous levies, for the service of morality and religion, has actually done much towards reducing and diluting the principle of reverential allegiance to the Church of our Fathers; nay, that it has done much to keep the Church in ignorance or forgetfulness of her own majesty and strength. It must, indeed, be confessed that, at that period, the state of the Church was, in some important respects, such as almost to invite the hand of unfilial rashness. It was the hour of her blameable weakness, and self-oblivion. And some, we fear, there were, even among her own sons, who then approached, unreverently, their slumbering parent, and went and told their brethren without, of her unbecoming and powerless condition. But, among these undutiful and most unnatural children, Wilberforce, most assuredly, is not to be numbered. The utmost that can be said of him, is, that, partly from accidents beyond his control, he had not been regularly trained to a due estimate of her inherent and indefectible claims upon our submission and respect. He had, probably, been taught to venerate the Church of England, rather as the religious establishment of his country, than as one branch of a divine institution. And, hence, he might scarcely be conscious of the evil and the danger of seeking assistance and co-operation from those who were either separated from her, or but feebly and loosely attached to her communion. We cannot but believe him to have been ignorant that, among his fellow-workers, there were some, who, not only despised her, but were secretly labouring for her dishonour and destruction.

But, the grand exploit of Wilberforce was the demolition of the *English* slave-trade; (we wish we could describe the issue of his exertions in more comprehensive terms). We say, his *grand exploit*, because it is chiefly by this, that his name is known, throughout the world, as the great benefactor,—the advocate-general,—of the human race. It would be idle to attempt a brief

history of this marvellous enterprize. We have already seen that the subject appears to have taken possession of him in his early boyhood. It was in 1787 that he publicly devoted himself to the cause. For twenty tedious years did he toil, and heave, and struggle. For a long time, the adventure appeared about as hopeful, as a change in the complexion of the beings whose deliverance he sought. It seemed like an attempt to subvert the laws of nature,—to alter the position of the tropics,—or to reform the vicissitudes of the seasons. The labour was, often, truly of a Sisyphean type. The stone would, sometimes, for a while, be hopefully advancing towards the summit: and then it would rush back again with an impetuous recoil. The hardy adventurer, however, appeared to laugh at “chance, and sufferance,” and disappointment. He seemed resolved to weary out the powers of evil themselves: and, at last, he met with his reward. On the 23rd of February, 1807, in the midst of the acclamations of the House, Romilly entreated the younger members to let that day’s event be a lesson to them, how much the rewards of virtue exceeded those of ambition: and, he, then, contrasted the feelings of the Emperor of the French in all his greatness, with those of that honored individual, who would, that night, lay his head upon his pillow, and remember that the *Slave-Trade was no more!*

At an early stage of this stupendous undertaking, he was animated by the following letter from John Wesley, probably the last he ever wrote; for it is docketed by Wilberforce—“Wesley’s last words:”

“My dear Sir,

Unless the Divine power has raised you up to be as *Athanasius contra mundum*, I see not how you can go through your glorious enterprise, in opposing that execrable villainy which is the scandal of religion, of England, and of human nature. Unless God has raised you up for this very thing, you will be worn out by the opposition of men and devils; but if God be for you, who can be against you? Are all of them together stronger than God? Oh be not weary of well-doing. Go on in the name of God, and in the power of His might, till even American slavery, the vilest that ever saw the sun, shall vanish away before it. That He who has guided you from your youth up may continue to strengthen you in this and all things, is the prayer of,

Dear Sir,

Your affectionate servant,

JOHN WESLEY.”

Whether, or not, slavery itself be a state of man utterly, and always, incompatible with the spirit of the Gospel, as this letter seems to take for granted, is a question which we shall not undertake to discuss. Be that as it may, still, with respect to the de-

testably inhuman process by which the slave-market of our colonies had been long supplied, no question will, surely, now be raised, except among men, whose nature is well nigh brutalized, and whose human sympathies have been seared by the burning lust of gain. The cause, then, to which Wilberforce dedicated all his noblest energies, was, most undoubtedly, a holy and a righteous cause: and his triumph was among the most astonishing in the history of man. It was, nevertheless, a triumph which was not to be achieved without the application of perilous instruments, and a resort to strange and wild auxiliaries! It is manifest that, in order to accomplish the victory, it was needful to appeal,—not only to the tender-hearted Christian,—not only to the enlightened and intelligent philanthropist,—not only to the high-minded, far-seeing, and disinterested patriot; but the fanatics of revolution,—the preachers of the rights of man,—the self-elected representatives of injured and oppressed humanity,—all these must, of necessity, be called in, to swell the general chorus of execration against the monster-abuse of the age. A banner was to be erected which should summon mankind into universal insurrection against fiendlike selfishness and crime. The cross of fire was to go forth, far and wide; and *the gathering* was to be from every tribe, and family, who professed to bear allegiance to the sacred cause of liberty.

The above is scarcely an exaggerated exhibition of the process, by which alone, *humanly speaking*, the adventure could possibly be achieved. To rely, for success, solely upon the suffrages of wise, and virtuous, and holy men, would have argued an intensity of faith, such as it would be almost a vain thing to look for, in the present state of the world. We scarcely see what was to be done, in those days, by any uninspired man, but to put his trust, under God, upon the power of those moral and humane emotions which have generally survived the fall. On carrying back our thoughts to the period, at which Wilberforce began to act, we can easily imagine how potently he must have been tempted to become all things to all men, in order that he might gain some to the cause which excited his own consuming zeal. Nay—more than this—from the moment in which he lifted up his voice in the legislature, we are unable to perceive how, if he had most earnestly desired it, he could possibly have preserved himself from the incumbrance—(for such it sometimes was),—of miscellaneous confederacy and aid. Philanthropy, like misery, will, sometimes, “acquaint a man with strange bed-fellows” and companions. And, thus it was with Wilberforce. He commenced his labours solely with the intent to deliver a large portion of the human race from physical sufferings too horrible to be thought of without anguish,—and a vast extent of coast from a frightful state

of moral depravity and degradation. But, the result to himself, personally, was, that he soon found himself the member of a vast and mixed fraternity, and claimed as the friend and the ally of nearly all the liberals and revolutionists in Europe.

In short, he found it unavoidable to call up "from the vasty deep," the potent and tremendous Genius of Agitation. And never, we verily believe, since the days of the Crusades, was that turbulent power brought into such general and mighty action. We all know how that power went forth, in those ruder times. We know how it stirred nearly all that is good, and all that is evil, in man's nature. We know how it collected, beneath the banner of the Cross, brave hearts that were beating with fervent though ill-taught devotion, and miscreant adventurers and ruffians, who, naturally, had their being in the midst of spoil, and havoc, and destruction. And we look with astonishment on the operation of the pure fire from the altar, when thus brought into sudden combination with the baser elements which pervade the world. Now, something of this sort, we cannot help thinking, was exemplified, during the whole of that astonishing process which ended in the downfall of the British traffic in "human flesh." It was an enterprize which was fitted to awaken all the purest feelings, and the grandest human energies. But it was, likewise, an enterprize which gave scope and occupation to the restless and legionary spirit of mischief and confusion. It brought together the Christian and the Infidel,—the stedfast Churchman and the unquiet Sectarian—the devoted loyalist and the Jacobinical conspirator,—the single-hearted friend of man, and the *Ami des Noirs*! All these it united, (as it was hoped,) in a blessed league, a holy alliance, against one of the most remorseless and abominable systems of cruelty and oppression with which the earth was ever cursed. The confederacy succeeded, it is true. And, we are bound to be thankful for its success. But, then, we may likewise be pardoned if we tremble at the terrible secret which was gradually disclosed in the course of its protracted operations,—the secret of that resistless strength which belongs to the spirit of universal and unwearied *Agitation*.

Little, we are fully persuaded, did Wilberforce suspect that he had summoned forth a spirit, which will probably never be commanded back to its confinement. From that time, to the present hour, it has been "going to and fro on the earth, and walking up and down in it." It was brought up to do the bidding of benevolence; to labour in a task which seemed to approve itself to God and man. But it has, since, been toiling in the service of very different masters. It has been the life and soul of what is called the *movement*. It has been driving forward the process of political regeneration. It has unchained the Papacy in Ireland.

It has let in a deluge of democracy upon our constitution. It is, at this moment, straining all its powers to undo the work of ages. It is loosening all the joints which have so long held the fabric of the monarchy together. It is busy in destroying the solid ducts and channels by which the waters of life should be safely and regularly distributed to every corner of the land; and it will not rest satisfied until the embankments are broken down, and the waters rush forth in turbid streams, spreading confusion over the country which they were designed to fertilize. In short, such is its compass and intensity of action, and such is its fierce malignity of temper, that, in our darker moments, we are tempted almost to regard it as one of the ever-varying forms of that mysterious power, to which the word of prophecy hath assigned the title of Antichrist.

It was not long before Wilberforce himself had "some taste of the quality" of this formidable and capricious "drudging goblin." For, it played him a shrewd knavish trick in the summer of 1792. The Jacobin Convention then delighted to honour him for his distinguished services in the cause of suffering humanity: and, as the most illustrious of all rewards that could be lavished on public virtue, they recorded his name on the immortal roll of French citizenship! It must be confessed that both he and his friends were vilely ungrateful for this high distinction. "I was provoked," writes one of them, "to see your name placed "on the list of citizens by the French *savages*. And for what! "Merely for taking up the cause of humanity, previous to their "taking up the cause of freedom; the love of which, even during "their first and best exertions, was not strong enough to induce "them to follow your humane steps." The embarrassment of Wilberforce may be easily imagined. It might have been awkward to divest himself of his blushing honours by any direct disclaimer or rejection. But it appears that he was extremely anxious and impatient "to prevent the ill effect which this vote "might have upon the abolition cause." And, accordingly, he went to a meeting held in London for the benefit of the French Emigrant Clergy; and there he consented to be on the committee, at Burke's request; *partly, as he acknowledges, to do away French citizenship!* And then who can describe the motley crowds which the cause of abolition, together with his other multifarious projects, perpetually collected round him at home; the "black spirits and white, the blue spirits and grey," which haunted his antichamber and his breakfast-table! It was his friend Hannah More who said that the scene reminded her, at times, of Noah's ark; a vast menagerie of "clean beasts, and of "beasts that are not clean, and of fowls, and of every thing that

“creepeth upon the earth.” His anti-room, we are told, was thronged from an early hour. Like every room in his house, it was well stored with books; and the experience of its necessity had led to the exchange of the smaller volumes, with which it was originally furnished, for cumbrous folios, “which could not be carried off, *by accident*, in the pocket of a coat.” On one chair sat a Yorkshire constituent, manufacturing or agricultural. On another, a petitioner for charity, or a house of commons client. On another, a Wesleyan preacher; while side by side with an African, a foreign missionary, or a Haytian professor, sat some man of rank, who had sought a *private* interview, and whose name had, accidentally, escaped announcement. (Vol. i. p. 256, 257.) This was his life in 1790; and it was very much the same, in 1808, at Kensington Gore. At that place, he was one morning endeavouring to relax the stiffness of a “starched little fellow,” whom he was anxious not to disgust, when Andrew Fuller of Kettering was announced. Not a moment was to be lost. So, before the rugged preacher was admitted, he said to his little friend, “You know Andrew Fuller?” “No, I never heard his name.” “O, then you *must* know him. He is an extraordinary man, whose talents have raised him from a very low situation.” The way being thus prepared, in walked Andrew, doing no harm, it is true, but looking the very picture of a blacksmith. “What extraordinary people Wilberforce does get around him!” exclaimed Banks one day in amazement. His astonishment, it seems, had been excited by the appearance of Dr. Coke, the Wesleyan, whom Wilberforce himself thus describes:—“I wish I could forget his little round face and short figure! Any one who wished to take off a Methodist could not do better than exactly copy his manner and appearance. He looked a mere boy when he was turned fifty; with such a smooth apple face, and a little round mouth, that, if it had been forgotten, you might have made as good a one by thrusting in your thumb.” On another day, his diary records “a large party to dinner, of very miscellaneous materials; some whom I had asked, but who had sent no answer; others coming without notice. Dr. Constaucio, Portuguese physician, intelligent, speaks English. Mr. Townsend, dissenting minister, Borough. Mr. Proctor from Yar-mouth, James Stephen, Dicey, and some more. Rational day enough.” Besides this almost daily influx, the Slave Committee dined with him once a week during the labours of the Abolition. Messrs. Clarkson, Dickson, and others, whom Pitt, wickedly enough, entitled Wilberforce’s *white negroes*, were his constant inmates, and formed a bureau, employed in classing, revising, and abridging evidence under his own eye. “I cannot invite you here,” he writes to a friend about to visit London, “for, during

“ the sitting of parliament my house is a mere hotel.”—(vol. iii. p. 255—257.)

When once the warfare of the Abolition Cause had been accomplished, other views began to expand themselves before the eyes of Wilberforce and his fellow workers. They were at length persuaded that their work must be miserably imperfect if it terminated in any thing short of the emancipation of the negroes, and the total destruction of slavery in our Colonies. And here, again, the blessing of Providence seemed once more to descend upon the labours of our *Athanasius contra mundum*. While he was on his dying couch, in July, 1833, the Bill for the Abolition of Slavery was read, for the second time, in the House of Commons; and, the last public information he ever received, was, that his country was willing to redeem itself from national disgrace, at any sacrifice. “ Thank God,” he exclaimed, “ that I should “ have lived to witness the day, in which England is willing to “ give twenty millions sterling, for the abolition of slavery.” It was, indeed, a glorious and animating *Nunc dimittis*, which he was then enabled to utter, after nearly half a century of arduous and incessant struggle! His friends had been led to express a hope that he might be spared to witness the consummation: and the fulfilment of their anticipations “ added signal interest to “ an event which, in the course of nature, might shortly be “ expected.”

And yet, after all, it is with but a faltering voice that we can echo back the notes of exultation with which the triumphs of Wilberforce have been welcomed! The British Slave Trade, it is true, has been demolished: and slavery itself is, at this moment, in a course of speedy extinction throughout our Colonies. But, alas! our example, as yet, has been almost powerless with the rest of Christendom. Slavery, in its most odious form, still disgraces and afflicts the fairest provinces of America,—the land whose independence was built up on the *self-evident* maxim, that all men are created free and equal! And, as for the horrors of the African traffic,—there is too much cause to fear that they have been frightfully aggravated by the partial success of our efforts for its abolition. Flags are still found to float over this horrible merchandize: and, the very restraints with which our humaner laws now seek to limit and embarrass it, have, hitherto, had little other effect, save that of sharpening the remorseless craft and ingenuity of those who still fatten on this vile source of gain. The vessels employed, in former times, in the African slave-trade, were, indeed, little better than pestilential dungeons, even under the regulations framed for their improvement by our legislature. But, unless we are grossly misinformed, they were spacious palaces, when compared with the floating *sarcophagi*,

which have, since, been substituted for them. We have heard from naval men, who speak from knowledge and experience, that the slavers now in use are sharp and narrow shells, of 70 or 80 tons burden, built for the express purpose of outsailing every thing, and of thus setting our cruisers at defiance. On board of these a living freight is crammed so closely, that a dreadful and quick mortality is the inevitable consequence. And the accursed calculation of the traders is, that, if only one-fourth of their cargo can be brought alive into the market, their adventure is sure to be prosperous and gainful! We dare not to trust ourselves with too close a contemplation of the maddening wretchedness which must be endured by the victims thus immolated to Mammon and to Moloch. If the cruelties inflicted on these poor degraded creatures were practised on so many swine, it would be a disgrace to human nature! Happy must they be whose sufferings are most speedily brought to an end! Neither is it possible to reflect, without unspeakable horror, on the ferocious barbarism thus perpetuated along a vast extent of country. The insatiable demand for slaves is found to obliterate every vestige of the domestic charities among the natives. Husbands will sell their wives, and parents will sell their children, if not for a mess of pottage, for a few gallons of rum, or a few pounds of gunpowder. Neighbouring tribes will carry on a perpetual course of kidnapping against each other. And the wretches, who themselves are undergoing suffocation and torture beneath the hatches of the slaver, would have consigned their brethren of the next village to the same fate, if such had been their fortune. Nay, we have actually heard of a negro who was thrice captured, and thrice released; and who, in spite of his repeated experience of the horrors of a slave-ship, sold himself again, each time, probably for no better a price than a modicum of alcohol, or a pouch-full of ammunition! One or two tribes there are, who sternly reject all attempts to engage them in this execrable commerce. But, still, these men scruple not to hire themselves among the crews of the slave-ships; and, instead of feeling compassion for the stifled crowds below, do but exult in their sufferings, as the fit reward of their own baseness and infatuation. It is melancholy and astounding to think that such a *residuum* of murderous atrocity should still be left, after all the *weariness and painfulness* of the abolition conflict! It would almost seem as if the God of mercy had, as yet, for unsearchable reasons, forbore finally to set his seal to a work, which, in human estimation, has on it the impress of beneficence and holiness. But, however this may be, it would really appear as if the labours of the gleaning were likely to be far more severe than those of gathering in the harvest!

One Wilberforce sufficed for the destruction of the British Slave Trade. But, at present, it seems doubtful whether a whole host of Wilberforces would suffice for the universal abolition of the traffic. And, without its universal abolition, what, it may be reasonably asked, has been gained to the cause of humanity?—If Agitation must needs be the grand agency by which, henceforth, the world is to be moved, who can forbear to wish that its powers had been wholly lavished upon the final extermination of this gigantic mischief, in its aggravated horrors, before it began to disport itself in wild experiments upon the sacred fabric of civilized society? It would, in that case, have had work enough for its occupation until the present hour. The *blacks* might, then, have had some prospect of deliverance from misery and degradation. And the *whites* might, at least, have had a long respite from the turmoil and terror of ceaseless movement and giddy revolution!

What remains to be told of Wilberforce's public history, though interesting enough in itself, is of subordinate importance when compared with the achievements we have already noticed. Of his other labours in behalf of the best interests of mankind, the most remarkable are his unwearied exertions for the promotion of Christianity in our Indian empire; and his efforts to extort a legislative recognition of the duty of providing for the moral and spiritual instruction of our colonial dependencies in general. His political course was still distinguished for independence and liberality. He opposed the grant to the College of Maynooth; but was a decided advocate for the emancipation of the Roman Catholics. He was disposed to put his trust in safeguards and securities: and he imagined that, even if the consciences of the Roman Catholics should be able to slip through the noose of a strict and solemn oath, still no *gentlemen* could ever be found who, after swearing not to disturb or endanger the Established Church, would dare to rise and propose any measure to its detriment. The event has shown that the safeguards and securities have all the solidity and strength of a rampart of the loosest sand; and that *gentlemen are* really to be found, whose sense of honour has been disciplined precisely in the same school, in which their consciences have been informed. He was moreover a steady supporter of Parliamentary Reform; and to this course he was chiefly impelled by his just abhorrence of bribery and drunkenness. When the final struggle arrived, which ended in the triumph of that cause, he had retired from public life; and we know not whether he was able to look, without dismay, on the tremendous sweep of the experiment.—His liberal friends were extremely anxious to secure the sanction of his name to their scheme of Mechanics' Institutes, and the

London University. But this was rather too much ! To instruct our artisans in natural philosophy, and to leave them in ignorance of the grounds of our faith, appeared to him to be merely an expedient for training up a race of self-conceited sceptics. And, to keep the most influential classes unarmed with a knowledge of the evidences of Christianity, in order to obtain the support of the Jews, was, in his judgment, "to render a measure, abominable in itself, still worse, by the motive assigned for its adoption." For a time, however, he lent his name to the project, in the hope of promoting some change in the system. But, in 1829, he found himself under the necessity of finally removing it.

In 1825, he retired from Parliament altogether ; and the rest of his days was passed in the serenity of domestic enjoyment, in varied literary recreation, and in the blessedness of that peace which passeth understanding ; though heavy trial awaited him before he was removed to the place where all trials are at an end.

His time was, henceforth, chiefly divided between one or other of his *parsonages*, as he called them : that is, between the residences of two of his sons, who were in the Church, and moderately beneficed. In 1833, he went to Bath, for the benefit of the waters : but, after a trial of two months, it was thought advisable that he should go to London, for the purpose of consulting Dr. Chambers. He arrived in Cadogan-place, Sloane-street, on the 19th of July ; and, there, with but a single groan, he peaceably breathed his last, on the 29th of July, aged seventy-three years and eleven months.

Notwithstanding the profound interest attached to the public career of Wilberforce—his toils in the promotion of good—his grapplings with evil—his wrestlings with spiritual wickedness in high places and in low,—we can hardly doubt that his biographers have found the chief delight and solace of their task, in the memorials of his private and domestic life. In this department of their work, they must have felt themselves, in every sense of the word, perfectly *at home*. At every step, they must have been consoled and supported by the thought, *Eheu ! quanto minus est cum aliis versari, quam tui meminisse !* They must have had the image of their honoured parent perpetually before their eyes. And seldom has there been seen on earth a more winning impersonation of virtue and holiness. If we may venture to say so much—it really seems as if there had been a perpetual rainbow round his head—a halo, bright with all the purest colours of heaven. There was not, indeed, much of outward comeliness in his form. On the contrary, his figure was somewhat diminutive, and devoid of symmetry ; and his features, individually regarded, must have appeared positively plain and ordinary, but that they were

flexibly obedient to the impulses from within. And yet was the appearance of this small ungainly person, the signal for enjoyment in every company that he approached. By natural temperament, indeed, he appears to have been full of vivacity, and cheerfulness. But, when these native qualities had been visited by

“ The touch ethereal of Heaven’s fiery rod,”

they assumed an unfailing serenity and brightness, which seemed to mark him out, to all who saw him, as one who was destined to shine in the eternal treasury, in the day when *the jewels* shall be finally made up. “ You must allow that Mr. Wilberforce is “ cheerful,” said some of his friends to one who had just passed a week in the same house with him, and who had been assailing religion with the everlasting imputation of dulness. “ Yes,” she replied, “ and no wonder. I should be always cheerful, too, if I “ could make myself as sure, as he does, that I was going to “ heaven.” The words were designed to convey a heartless, and we cannot forbear to add, an exceedingly stupid, sarcasm. But, —something after the manner of Caiaphas,—the speaker gave utterance to a substantial truth, albeit she knew it not. It might be said of Wilberforce that he felt habitually certain of heaven: for the kingdom of heaven was already within him. He was never inflated with the vapours of spiritual presumption. That was far from him, at all times; and, even when death was at hand, his very last words were expressive of a humble trust, but not of a positive confidence, that his feet were *on the rock*. But, still, throughout all his days, he appeared to be, as it were, on the confines of heaven; for he lived in a perpetual atmosphere of gratitude and love. Every thing he saw and heard supplied his *heart* with aliment. To him, flowers were the smiles of the beneficent Creator.

“ The common air, the sun, the skies,
To him, were opening paradise.”

He found “ sermons in stones, and good in every thing.” Religion invested him with that, which is said to be one of the choicest attributes of genius,—the power of extracting nectar out of insipidity itself,—the faculty of discerning the elements of beauty or of grandeur, where others can see nothing but monotony and littleness. It was said of him by Mackintosh that he never met with so *amusable* a man,—with one who touched life in so many points. The secret of his happiness may be seen in his Journal, which is pervaded, throughout, by the spirit of humility and thankfulness. “ Who is there,” he there asks, “ that has so many “ blessings? Let me record some of them:—Affluence, without

“ the highest rank. A good understanding and a happy temper.
 “ Kind friends, and a greater number than almost any one. Do-
 “ mestic happiness beyond what could have been conceived
 “ possible. A situation in life most honourable ; and above all,
 “ a most favourable situation for eternity—the means of grace in
 “ abundance, and repeated motions of conscience, the effect, I
 “ believe, of the Holy Spirit. Which way soever I turn I see
 “ marks of the goodness and long-suffering of God. Oh, that I
 “ may be more filled with gratitude !

“ How merciful that I was not early brought into office, in
 “ 1782-3-4 ! This would probably have prevented my going
 “ abroad, with all that, through the providence of God, followed.
 “ Then my having such kind friends, my book, &c. All has suc-
 “ ceeded with me, and God has by his preventing grace kept me
 “ from publicly disgracing the Christian profession. O my soul,
 “ praise the Lord, and forget not all His mercies. God is love,
 “ and His promises are sure. What though I have been sadly
 “ wanting to myself, yet we are assured that those that come
 “ unto Him He will in no wise cast out. I therefore look
 “ to Him with humble hope, I disclaim every other plea than
 “ that of the publican, offered up through the Redeemer ; but I
 “ would animate my hopes, trusting in Him that He will perfect,
 “ stablish, strengthen, settle me.”—vol. iii. pp. 61, 62.

That he was ever on the watch against the treacherous whisper-
 ings of the passion which tempts us to seek *great things for*
ourselves, is manifest, both from the tenor of his life, and the
 secret record of his thoughts. “ On looking back,” he says, in
 1805, “ what sad proofs have I had lately of the inward workings
 “ of ambition, on seeing others, once my equals, or even my in-
 “ feriors, rise to situations of high wordly rank, station, power,
 “ and splendour ! I bless God, I do not acquiesce in these
 “ vicious tempers, but strive against them, and not, I hope, in
 “ vain. Remember, O my soul, no man can serve two masters.
 “ Have I not a better portion than this world can bestow ?
 “ Would not a still higher situation place both me and my chil-
 “ dren in less favourable circumstances for making our calling
 “ and election sure ? Covet not then, O my soul, these objects of
 “ worldly anxiety. Let God be thy portion, and seek the true
 “ riches, the glory and honour which are connected with immor-
 “ tality. Yet turn not from those who have these honours with
 “ cynical or envious malignity, but rejoice in their temporal com-
 “ fort and gratification, while you pray for them, and strive to do
 “ them good, by preventing them from being injured by their ex-
 “ altation.”—vol. iii. pp. 209, 210.

That charity, was with him the brightest of the Christian

graces, is sufficiently proved by the fact, that the strictness of his own views never betrayed him into an ungenerous estimate of the worth of other men. Of Pitt he pronounced that he was the first of *natural men*, though the least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he. And, afterwards, he adds the following noble testimonies :—" He (Pitt) is really,—I say it solemnly, appealing to heaven for the truth of my words,—in my judgment, one of the most public-spirited and upright, and the most desirous of spending the nation's money economically, and of making sacrifices for the public good, of all the men I ever knew." And, again ;—" I will declare my solemn conviction," he writes to a friend, " that you greatly injure Mr. Pitt by the opinion you entertain of him. And it is my deliberate judgment, formed on much experience, and close observation, that he has more disinterested patriotism and a purer mind than almost (I scarce need say almost) any man, not under the influence of Christian principles, I ever knew. That he has weaknesses and faults I freely confess, but a want of ardent zeal for the public welfare, and of the strictest love of truth, are not, I believe as God shall judge me, of the number. I speak not this from the partiality of personal affection. In fact, for several years past, there has been so little of the *eadem velle and eadem nolle*, that our friendship has starved for want of nutriment. I really love him for his public qualities and his private ones, though there too he is much misunderstood. But how can I expect he should love me much, who have been so long rendering myself in various ways vexatious to him, and above all, when, poor fellow, he never schools his mind by a cessation from political ruminations, the most blinding, hardening, and souring of all others i"—vol. ii. pp. 269, 270.

Nay, even Lord Byron was not excommunicated from the pale of his benevolent and charitable hopes. For, one day, when a friend was reading to him some passages from the life of that strange being, he suddenly interrupted the reader by the exclamation : " There now ; surely there was good feeling in that !"

With the peculiar complexion of his religious principles, the world has long been perfectly acquainted. If those principles are to be judged solely by the fruits which they produced, in his own personal character, we should be impelled to pronounce that they left scarcely any thing to be desired. On a more deep and comprehensive view, however, we may perhaps be forgiven for the suggestion, that a profounder acquaintance with the earlier history of the Church, and a more correct estimate of her office and position, might have given a more vigorous, and more truly *Catholic* tone, to his theological opinions, and have armed him with a still

more beneficial influence on Christian society. However, as controversy and discussion are not our present objects, we shall abstain from a topic which might possibly appear ungracious and unseasonable. We are reluctant to speak, or even to think, of defects, where we find so much to love, to honour, and to admire. One or two things we feel ourselves bound to notice, in justice to his memory; because they show that the natural bias and tendency of his mind was towards the soundest views, touching religious matters. In the first place, we find, from his Journal, that, notwithstanding his habit of recording his own religious experiences, he was early on his guard against the seductive error, that the religious state is to be ascertained by the application of a sort of spiritual thermometer. "This morning (Sunday)," he writes, in 1795, "I felt the comfort of sober religious self-con-
"versation. Yet, true Christianity lies, not in frames and feel-
"ings, but in diligently doing the work of God." Further,—although he was, in general, ready enough to learn from the wise and the good of every denomination,—he appears to have been very properly apprehensive of the danger of *itching ears*, and of the propensity of men to *heap up teachers to themselves*. On one occasion, he refused to go and hear Robert Hall; alleging that we attend public worship, in order to be edified, not by human eloquence, but by the Holy Ghost. Again,—the following extract of a letter of his to Hannah More, in 1823, shows that he escaped the epidemic infatuation which was then crowding, almost to suffocation, the meeting-house of Edward Irving:—

"You have doubtless heard of the prevailing *fashion* of resorting to the conventicle to hear Dr. Chalmers's late assistant, Mr. Irving. It is not merely the opposition members of both Houses, Lord Lansdown, Mackintosh, &c. that attend him; their political nonconformity might be supposed to endear to them his ecclesiastical dissent: but the orthodox Lord Liverpool, the vindicator of existing institutions Mr. Canning, press into his meeting-house; and even with tickets you must be at the door an hour before the service commences, if you wish to get in without losing one of your coat-pockets by mere mobbing. I have not yet been to hear him. Indeed, I did not think it quite of good example to adopt the prevailing rage. It is literally true (I was told by one who was present), that an opera frequenter related as a part of the green room's conversation of the last Saturday night, 'Shall you go to Irving's to-morrow?' It is with no little pleasure I have heard that he is a man not only of extraordinary powers, (though even once hearing him speak at one of our anniversary meetings satisfied me that he sadly needs the chastening hand of a sound classical education,) but of orthodox principles and personal piety, and I am assured too, of a fine, disinterested spirit. I thought that you would like to receive some certain intelligence of this extraordinary 'performer;' for such, with all his merits, he now appears."—vol. v. pp. 188, 189.

Lastly, we learn that he lamented the desuetude into which the ordinances of the Church had fallen, as regards the observance of the days appointed for fasting and humiliation. "We attend too little to these days," he writes, on Ash-Wednesday, in 1831. The delicacy of his own constitution was such as to make rigorous abstinence impracticable, at any time. But he never lost sight of the principle. He varied the quality of his diet, on suitable occasions, in such a manner, as to remind him that practical Christianity involves a crucifixion of the flesh.

One word respecting the intellectual capacities and accomplishments of Wilberforce. He appears to have been gifted with a singular activity and versatility of mind. His resources were ample and various, and easily producible. In the estimation of Madame de Staël—who seems to have thought that talking was the chief final cause of the creation of man—he must have been among the first of human beings; for she said of him, "Mr. Wilberforce is the best *converser* I have met with in this country. I have always heard that he was the most religious, and I now find that he is the wittiest man, in England." The House of Commons, however, was the theatre of all others the best fitted for the exhibition of his mental peculiarities. His oratory was rich and vivid, and, frequently, impassioned in a very high degree. But it was, also, at times, loose, and rambling, and deficient in that vigorous condensation which acts with the momentum of a battering-ram. This might, occasionally, be the consequence of insufficient preparation. But, for the most part, we conceive, it may be ascribed to a peculiarity of temperament. He was, by nature, active, almost to restlessness. He found it difficult to plod, long together, in a perfectly even path. His motions were circuitous. He was as laborious as the bee; but, withal, quite as brisk, nimble, and excursive. His erratic propensity was exemplified, in various ways, throughout a considerable portion of his life. At one time, no man ever lived so much upon the wing. It would be curious to trace out all his flittings from one spot to another. A single instance may suffice. At the close of an excursion, in 1827, his Diary records that, in the course of six months, he had made no less than six and thirty visits! These rapid and devious movements were, in a considerable degree, typical of his mental character, as it sometimes manifested itself in his public and parliamentary exertions. Nevertheless, he was capable of the mightiest efforts. On grand occasions, he has rarely been surpassed. It has been justly observed, that he held a very "high and conspicuous place in oratory, even at a time when English eloquence rivalled whatever we read of in Athens or in Rome." He was, moreover, eminently en-

dowed with that sagacity and tact, which are among the most serviceable qualities of a great public speaker. "If there is any one," said Canning, "who understands thoroughly the tactics of debate, and knows exactly what will carry the House along with him, it certainly is my honourable friend, the member for Bramber." Of this, we have one most memorable instance. In 1817, he supported the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, as a severity which, under all the existing circumstances of the country, he deemed absolutely unavoidable. On this, he was assailed by an honourable member, with the following most unworthy and offensive sarcasm:—"The honourable and religious member"—as this person addressed him, in the midst of cries of *order* from all sides of the House—"could hardly vote for any measure more opposed to *vital Christianity*." The retort of Wilberforce was exterminating! "I shall take no notice," he began, "of what has been said concerning myself; though I claim no credit for my silence. For, I am well convinced, that there is not a man in this House who would not feel lowered by replying to such language as the honourable member has allowed himself to use." And afterwards, turning towards the aggressor, "How," he exclaimed—"how can the honourable member talk thus of those religious principles on which the welfare of the community depends? I would fain believe that he desires as sincerely as I do myself to perpetuate to his country the blessings she enjoys. But if I could be base enough to seek the destruction of those institutions which we both profess to revere, I will tell him what instrument I would choose. I would take a man of great wealth, of patrician family, of personal popularity, aye, and of respectable talents, and I am satisfied that such a one, while he scattered abroad the firebrands of sedition under pretence that he went all lengths for the people, would in reality be the best agent in the malevolent purpose of destroying their liberties and happiness."—vol. iv. p. 328.

"Never, in my Parliamentary life"—said a member present—"never did I hear a speech which carried its audience more completely with it, or was listened to with such breathless attention!" His opponent, we are told, was remarkable for a tall erect figure. But, "when Wilberforce turned round to address him, amidst the cheers of the House, he seemed like a pigmy in the grasp of a giant. I never"—says the witness—"saw such a display of moral superiority in my life."

But, here we must break off. It is well known that, in consequence of a public and most honourable requisition, the remains

of this illustrious Christian, instead of being deposited in a private sepulchre, were solemnly interred in Westminster Abbey. "It was remarked"—say his biographers, with whose words we conclude—"by one of the Prelates who took part in this striking scene, that considering how long he had retired from active life, and that his intellectual superiority could be known only by tradition to the generation which thus celebrated his obsequies, there was a sort of testimony to the moral sublimity of his Christian character in this unequalled mark of public approbation. For while a public funeral had been matter of customary compliment to those who died in official situations, this voluntary tribute of individual respect from the mass of the great legislative bodies of the land, was an unprecedented honour. It was one moreover to which the general voice responded. The crowd of equipages which followed his funeral procession was unusually great. The Abbey was thronged with the most respectable persons. 'You will like to know,' writes a friend, 'that as I came towards it down the Strand, every third person I met going about their ordinary business was in mourning.' A subscription was immediately opened among his friends in London; it was agreed to place his statue in Westminster Abbey, and as a yet more appropriate memorial, that some charitable endowment should perpetuate his name. Public meetings were held at York and Hull on the occasion, and in the former place, a county asylum for the blind has since been founded in honour of him, while his townsmen of Hull have raised a column to his memory.

"It would be vain to mention all the marks of respect which were paid to him by the public societies in which he had borne part. Nor were there wanting other more private, but not less affecting, tokens of regard. A number of those who had been indebted to his kindness met after his funeral, 'with feelings,' as one of them expressed it in touching, and, it is hoped, not unseemly words, 'almost as disconsolate as those of the bereaved apostles, to lament his loss.' 'Great part of our coloured population, who form here an important body,' writes a dignified clergyman from the West Indies, 'went into mourning at the news of his death.' The same honour was paid him by this class of persons at New York, where also an eulogium (since printed) was pronounced upon him by a person publicly selected for the task, and their brethren throughout the United States were called upon to pay the marks of external respect to the memory of their benefactor. For departed kings there are appointed honours, and the wealthy have their gorgeous obsequies: it was his nobler portion to clothe a people with

“spontaneous mourning, and go down to the grave amid the benedictions of the poor.

“It is impossible to conclude this history without observing the striking testimony which it bears to that inspired dictate; ‘Godliness has the promise of the life that now is as well as of that which is to come.’ If ever any man drew a prosperous lot in this life, he did so, who has been here described. Yet his Christian faith was from first to last his talisman of happiness. Without it, the buoyancy of his youthful spirits led to a frivolous waste of life, not more culpable than unsatisfying. With it came lofty conceptions—an energy which triumphed over sickness and languor, the coldness of friends and the violence of enemies—a calmness not to be provoked—a perseverance which repulse could not baffle. To these virtues was owing the happiness of his active days. Through the power of the same sustaining principle, his affection towards his fellow-creatures was not dulled by the intercourse of life, nor his sweetness of temper impaired by the irritability of age. A firm trust in God, an undeviating submission to His will, an overflowing thankfulness—these maintained in him to the last that cheerfulness which this world could neither give nor take away. They poured even upon his earthly pilgrimage the anticipated radiance of that brighter region, to which he has now doubtless been admitted. For *‘the path of the just is like the shining light, which shineth more and more unto the perfect day.’*”—vol. v. pp. 376—378.

ART. II.—1. *Sabbation, Honor Neale, and other Poems.* By Chenevix Trench, Perpetual Curate of Curdridge Chapel, Hants, Author of the *Story of Justin Martyr*. London. Moxon. 1838.

2. *Memorials of a Residence on the Continent, and Historical Poems.* By Richard Monckton Milnes, Author of a *Tour in Greece*. London. Moxon. 1838.

3. *Poems of many Years.* By R. M. Milnes. London. Moxon. 1838.

Looking at poetry in its results, what strikes us most forcibly is its value in enabling mankind at large to sympathize with each other; not in that general and rough way which arises naturally from a common object, common friends, or common subjects of interest, but through all the minuter shades of thought and feeling. This sympathy not only furnishes one of the highest and most acute pleasures of social intercourse, but is, as every one

must feel, almost the peculiar instrument by which esteem is warmed into confidence and affection. The constraint and distance which we are so apt to be conscious of in the company of those whom we highly respect, but whose peculiar tone of feeling we cannot appreciate, or who seem careless or incapable of entering into ours, is a ready proof of this, especially when contrasted with the easy and almost affectionate familiarity which often springs from an apparent coincidence of sentiment and taste, even with little or no evidence of soundness of heart. This however is obviously a superficial feeling, and proportionably common. The sympathy which is really to be coveted is deep as well as delicate; being based on that which is the only real foundation of friendship between earnest men, similar moral tendencies, ripening as life goes on, if they do not grow rank and sickly, into similar or analogous objects and pursuits. That this kind of sympathy is incomparably more valuable both in the way of enjoyment, and in its influence over our own and others' conduct, is a matter of experience which a large, perhaps the larger, proportion of ordinary men know to be true, and the rest would not willingly appear ignorant of. Each is good in its way, but one lies at the bottom of our nature,—is what we were made for; the other is only its amusement and exercise. One is to the other what a noble statue is to an arabesque pattern, deep music to pleasing sounds, happiness to amusement, a noble enterprize to a game at chess. The one, though fraught with pleasant excitement, and probably with intellectual improvement and kind feeling, we feel to be but of momentary interest; the other, within the mere outward form of wit, imagination, subtlety or vigour, betrays a life of which they are but the bodily limbs, full of rich and indefinite promise. In this case each coincidence of thought becomes, like the opening of an interesting subject, a pledge for we know not how much besides of friendship and confidence. If in conversation any one merely uses an argument, an illustration, a conceit, which has occurred, or very nearly occurred to ourselves, and which, as having done so, we think ingenious and happy, we are amused and think no more about the matter; but if any one displays a point of characteristic feeling, or implies any fact, not obvious, in his own moral nature, of which we are also conscious in ourselves, we instantly feel so much the nearer him than we were, more anxious to like him, more inclined to find meaning in what he says, and ourselves in turn almost privileged to assume a more confidential tone, and to expect greater attention. This is the sympathy which, in private, makes men love instead of liking each other; and in public, binds masses together for great purposes, penetrating into every subject, from the most minute to the greatest, and swaying, with

a power unanalyzable and incalculable, a multitude even more easily, as historians say, than a fire-side party. No one who has observed the inconsistent obstinacies and vacillations of ordinary men on matters of opinion and practice, can fail of seeing that, in point of fact, one half of what is done or believed, is done and believed by or for the sake of this sympathy. Men will, in general, obstinately submit to the mere assertion of those who have given them proof of having hearts like their own, and obstinately resist the most unanswerable arguments of an uncongenial mind; will abide by the guesses of him who feels their perplexities, rather than the demonstration of him who does not. In spite of speculative difficulties they will, with few exceptions, fall ultimately into that society, that political or religious party, with whom they can feel; or, if they do not, it will be far more generally by the influence of some counter sympathy, from individual friendship or the absence of circumstances to bring their false position home to them, than from attachment to any mere abstract opinions. Again, let any one compare the additional weight which actually attaches to any given opinion from being held by considerable bodies of men, with what might be expected if the mere probability arising from their concurrence were accurately weighed in the eye of simple reason. Men will not embrace a system, however strong the arguments for it, unless it promises them something, as it were, of a home, and will embrace any if it does. Indeed the mere fact that we are separated by thousands of miles or hundreds of years, by mere space or time, from those who act on a certain theory, is capable of acting on the will like an argument against it.

Now, to the regulation of these sympathies, poetry addresses itself in a way in which nothing else does or can. Its power to produce broad and strong effects over uneducated masses is enough attested by all history, from Tyrtæus to Dibdin, (writers, by the way, who aim with a directness quite remarkable at calling forth a *fellow feeling* among their hearers,) and is pointedly recognized by one well capable of judging, in the well-known aphorism that "if he might make a nation's ballads, whoever would might make their laws." This however is here merely mentioned lest we should seem to exclude it, our especial wish being to illustrate its advantages for uniting in moral sympathy *educated* minds. This will be best seen by observing what are the obstacles it has to overcome. That which it is to elicit is obviously, as one of the highest, so one of the rarest kinds of enjoyment. And why? In the first place, the harmony of feeling on which it is founded is not very general; but besides this there are peculiar difficulties in the way of its reciprocal expres-

sion even where it does exist. Few people know any thing at all below the surface of their own feelings till it is told them, and not immediately even then; still fewer can convey them adequately to others. Again, what lies deep does not, and cannot while mankind is what it is, form the ordinary subject of conversation, and when it is introduced it is very difficult to be sure that it is genuine feeling and not mere formulæ and technical inferences which we are exchanging. Feelings are difficult to analyze, difficult to express, seldom brought forwards into view, and suspicious when so brought forward.

Now the first and most fatal obstacle, real dissimilarity of character, it certainly is not the office of poetry, scarce of any kind of literature as such, directly to remove. Poetry is addressed, if to any, to those who do sympathize if they knew it; speaking loosely, it only elicits and gives shape to feeling; does not destroy, or create, or infuse it; it does not convert; for this something more real and stringent is required. Facts are ordinarily necessary; actual kindness conferred; actual sympathy shown; actual good examples given. Literature, indeed, may be a record of facts, which if believed may be of indefinite power in changing men's hearts: but here literature does not act as such. Or, again, wonders may be worked by the exhibition in practice of feelings which poetry first revealed to their possessors. But here poetry does not act *directly*. The utmost which it thus does is to smooth down inconsistencies.

Its effect in furnishing vent and communication to feeling which does, distinctly or indistinctly, exist, is not thus limited. There is no objection or obstacle to the expression or recognition of feeling which it does not seem peculiarly calculated to meet. First, it enables us to know ourselves, and is an expression of that knowledge. Numberless minute thoughts and emotions pass through our mind without leaving any impression, which it is the peculiar office of the poet to arrest, expand, and present to us. Some of these may be important, some may not. Often certainly they are most meaning, and such as we feel most pleasure in sharing with others. But in any case there would be comparatively little chance of our recognizing them in ourselves or tracing them in others were they not so presented.

Many persons will have felt that a poetical expression of feeling, the truth of which hardly struck them at all on reading, has yet, when once admitted into the mind, taken advantage, as it were, of some after-circumstances to make itself understood, and has then instantly seemed to furnish a picture of or clue to a whole course of past feeling and action: and that in so plain and unambiguous a way, that we are quite unable to account for our having failed so long to connect the reality with the represen-

tation. This is even a stronger instance for our purpose than those more obvious cases where the thought strikes home at once. Our having failed to recognize our own feelings when first set before us, shows more unquestionably the degree of indistinctness from which poetry has to rescue us. Even as furnishing similar objects of contemplation to those who were at heart alike, as familiarizing their minds with, and interesting them in the same parts of their nature, this would go far towards bringing them into tune, as it were, with each other: and in fact it does much more, in enabling them to meet at once and understand each other in points where they will most readily respond. The poet not only is a connecting link, but he points to a common ground. He brings the instruments into harmony, and suggests the chords which are to be sounded.

Again, if we were all ever so conscious of our own feelings, and ever so able to express them adequately, there would remain a still more important hindrance to their communication in the reserve which people feel concerning what touches them deeply—a necessary reserve arising from the double fear of speaking confidentially to those who do not really sympathize with them, and of seeming or being ostentatious of their sensitiveness. We know how long men of very high and acute feelings may be misunderstood by those in most constant communication with them, as heavy, proud, cynical, or even unfeeling; not perhaps without some fault of their own, but still with no greater than men ordinarily incur in some way or other in common society, and how, in their turn, they misunderstand men of freer and more buoyant tempers; each perhaps despising the frivolity, or disliking the moroseness, of the other for the same fancied deficiencies, and from the very same cause; because each moves about with more or less of a veil on. And if any thing of this *appears*, being a thing which by its nature escapes observation, it must *exist* to an indefinitely greater extent.

Now all this, as has been before implied, is no obstacle to men's acting together, or to their respecting each other; but it is a very great obstacle, as great as well can be, to warm confidential intimacy, which is not so plentiful in the world that we can afford to lose it. Here is the difficulty: confidence,—sympathy ought to be, it is scarce too much to say, our greatest earthly pleasure; that which, even in our general intercourse with each other, we should always be striving to enjoy, if a Christian community were what a Christian community ought to be, and should feel that we performed a duty in enjoying. We see many frank and eager people who consciously or unconsciously do so act; who will never rest in mere agreeable routine conversation, but are ever flying to something which has a stronger hold on their

own or others' feelings; people who are strongly alive to the claim which every human being has to be an object of interest to every other human being, who are good-hearted enough to take this universal interest in others, and simple-hearted enough to expect it for themselves. Often of course this is but frivolous egotistical chattering, but often it is not; and when men join with it, as they often do, modesty, strength, and independence of character, when the objects which occupy their own minds are sufficiently rational, and their mode of dealing with them sufficiently true and manly to give them a fair claim on the attention of others, and when the sympathy with which they answer such attention is that of benevolence, not of gossiping curiosity, then the kind feeling which they create around them, and the good qualities which, by expecting them, they bring to light, may serve to show us how very much we lose, not only of enjoyment, but of improvement, by moving about unknown to one another. By seeing the good which such men do elicit, we may judge how much we may be undervaluing each other. It is one thing however to see our disadvantages, another to remedy or obviate them. It is true that such persons as have been described do draw forth good when any one else would fail to discover it. But any observant and refined mind would scarce fail to see that this is not done without considerable infraction of the respect due to thoughts and feelings, which, not only as our own, but as shared and cherished by many wiser and better than ourselves, deserve to be treated in no random or inconsiderate way. It implies a peculiar kind of insensibility or inattention; a want not exactly of delicacy, but of tact and observation. Persons who are thus general in their communications would perhaps be as much shocked as any one else at the thought of speaking in their honest confidential way to those who at heart ridiculed or despised, or were wearied at it. Still they do so speak—they are “too good for this world”—too ready to judge of others by themselves; and when they speak of what strongly and rightly interests themselves, they do not expect, and are therefore slow to perceive, that they are being put off with cold acquiescence, or hollow unreal affectation, and in consequence, without seeing it, they do dishonour to the good feelings which they so nakedly exhibit. What, then, is to be done? Are we still one by one to go through the same alternations of hopes and disappointments, thoughts elevating and degrading, perplexities, struggles, failures, and consolations, unencouraged by the knowledge that others are passing along our own course, many far before,—many, perhaps, we know not who, far behind; but still thousands more or less, and some with a strangely minute coincidence, conscious of all those great and little temptations, impediments, desires, and reliefs, which, with-

out some intimation of their existence elsewhere, we should fancy too eccentric or complicated, perhaps too inconsistent or unworthy, to have sprung up in other hearts than our own? How are those who feel they have something within them to do justice to that something, to give it form and shape, and to plant it in the hearts of others, without setting themselves up as butts for cold ridicule or foolish sentimental interest? Some men struggle against the difficulty by throwing deep truths abroad on the world wrapped in jest, irony, or paradox, unveiling themselves only to those who have quickness of perception to detect the warmth within this uncongenial clothing. Irony and paradox, however, seem but inadequate media to convey that which should be above all things winning and elevating. Vigorous, indeed, penetrating and earnest, if earnestly used, they are, but of a forbidden and suspicious aspect: they scarce lose their ambiguity even when understood. We seem to want a voice, which, while it seems unmeaning to the world, speaks loudly and freely to those who are worthy to hear,—a writing, if it were possible, which should be colourless to the many, but flash unfailingly into meaning and brilliancy under the warm gaze of kindred feeling. Words, if it may be reverently said, like those of Scripture, which shall carry indeed a sufficient and intelligible sense to all who apply their intellects to seek it,—far more, perhaps, shall have grandeur and beauty and power to extort admiration from the critic and man of taste, yet only unveil the real and abiding truth which they contain to those whose hearts have half anticipated it. Let us see whether poetry does not in a very remarkable way answer this difficulty.

A *poetical* way of viewing things is that which is opposed to a matter-of-fact one; it is poetical so far as it does not rest in the mere phenomena which it handles, but aims at informing them with something spiritual, ideal, unearthly; and any object or thought is ordinarily called poetical so far as it refuses to be appreciated except through this medium. A comfortable English homestead, for example, which has a very sufficient explanation of its own, less so than a landscape, which forces on us fantastic associations, desolation, or a storm; or, again, a storm itself is less so to sailors on board, on whom it enforces certain definite practical consequences quite sufficient to engross their attention, than to landmen, who can contemplate it in quiet. What again constitutes a metaphor or an illustration poetical? not the mere grandeur or grace of the images of which it is composed; nor yet its truth, its efficacy in explaining the subject in hand, or in concentrating the attention on it. Rather the contrary; rather its virtue in transmuting what it touches, in carrying our eye through

the material phenomena with which it is occupied to that, perhaps most vague, something which is the associating link in the poet's mind; which to his eye both illustration and thing illustrated point at or embody, the truth to which they are a kind of approximation. Mr. Wordsworth's poem, called "Nutting," though it cannot be called illustration or metaphor, is a very pointed instance of what we mean. Again, what is the common poetical element in the characters of Hamlet, Miranda, Shylock, and Caliban? Not certainly goodness or beauty, if the two latter are poetical conceptions; not merely their truth or consistency, else Miss Austen would be one of the greatest of poets, but that indescribable glowing elevation of tone which runs alike through all, and seems alike to lift us off the ground and make us tread in air while we read them. Poetry is essentially an aspiration; is the effort to realize, or rather more, the partial realization of things not seen or proved; is faith,—often a false and wicked faith,—often an unconscious faith, (for it does not analyze itself,)—often most indefinite in its object in proportion as it is unearthly, and dealing with those indefinite intimations of what is unearthly, which we find in feelings, coincidences, and analogies. Without this feeling no man can be in any true sense a poet; though a clever man, by simulating it, may write interesting poetry; with it in some sense he *must* be. Accuracy of observation, fertility and vividness of conception, power and variety of language, activity and comprehensiveness of thought, skill in combination and disposition,—a certain number of these are necessary to make a great poet, for by great poet we mean one who gives an adequate shape to all he feels; all, and perhaps many more, to make a faultless one; but they are mere accessories, conditions for the expression of poetry, not the thing itself. There is not one of them which may not belong to the merest wit, the merest politician, or the merest reasoner. One who is a poet indeed has or is struggling after a solution for nature, (if he is a good man too, *the solution*,) which he is ever, according to his talent, applying to all the opposite phenomena which surround him. His solution indeed is not a logical one,—it is no proposition or set of propositions, no analysis or explanation of the wonders and inconsistencies of nature. He receives results fearlessly and in faith, as he finds them, and though, viewed through the rich ether with which he clothes them, they cease to be difficult or perplexing, wonders and inconsistencies they remain. It is his tone, his way of seeing, which harmonizes every thing, and which he struggles to communicate. He is ever presenting different objects under the same light, and the same objects under different lights, changing our position and his own, like one who wishes to make

us see towers and faces in the clouds or in the fire ; trying every avenue to our hearts, every joint in our armour, if by any means men may be awakened into seeing with their eyes ; or in pure joy at the light he has, he is throwing it forth in his own way, in the full faith that there must be those in the world who have the heart to comprehend it.

This, it must be confessed, is somewhat vague ; but it is at any rate so far true, that, while it leaves the poet truth as his subject, it gives him the privilege of not being taken *quite* literally. He is allowed to place his thoughts and feelings before others, not *exactly* as he thinks and feels them, but with a certain golden colouring, in which far more of firm faith or acute sensibility may be expressed than he would venture in plain truth to arrogate to himself. And if he is not bound to feel *exactly* what he expresses, to how much is he bound ? What are we to understand him really to mean ? What is ornament and what deep truth ? What heart and what fancy ? We must be content to guess how much he means, by feeling ourselves how much is true : as in the case of irony or caricature. We must believe not what his poems *say*, but what they *evidence*. And as a writer who does not claim or receive credit for what he says because he says it, but only so far as it carries intrinsic evidence of being genuine, feels that he may speak nobly without ostentation, so he may paint freely, without profaning, his own feelings and their objects, when he knows that those who would treat the realities with coldness or ridicule, are in no way likely to suspect the existence of any reality at all, but would view and criticize its expression (if it did not escape them altogether) as a mere poetical licence, a flight of imagination, a conception, good or bad, successful or a failure, as might chance. And what poetry is to the poet, criticism on his poetry is to his admirers. It has been observed already, what every one must feel who has ever discussed a favourite author, how unfailingly it elicits similarity of sentiment when that similarity exists. It ought here to be remarked how naturally and unostentatiously it does so. The line between dispassionate scientific criticism and that which comes from the heart is as elastic as that which separates poetical ornament from reality. And the critic accordingly has his share of the poet's security ; he is only appreciated when he is true, only understood when he is appreciated. But this need not be dwelt on ; no one at all conversant with popular conversational criticism can fail to see how much it is the case. We should like to know how many of the Elizabethan gallants who thought Caliban a good joke, or of the ladies who thought Ariel a sweet little thing, for such people, or their counterparts, must have been then, as now, detected, or

would have cared for that idea of pure unworldliness which the whole scheme of "The Tempest," as well as almost every character and contrast which it contains, from Ariel to Caliban, from Miranda to Trinculo, from Prospero to Sebastian, is calculated to bring out. And yet it is not unusual with Shakspeare, rather it is his habit, consciously or unconsciously, so to dedicate his plays; to make the characters, bad as well as good, converge, as it were, on some noble moral conception. Pomp and magnificence form the appropriate atmosphere of the play in which Henry VIII. is the presiding luminary, and in it Buckingham, Katharine, and Wolsey are raised before us, one by one, to show in their successive falls, and Cranmer, in his trial, how pride of birth, of place, and of conscious innocence, and, lastly, how meek humility avail against sudden ruin. So unsuspecting confidence seems, as it were, the key note to "Othello;" energy of will and the domestic duties to "Macbeth" and "King Lear;" and to suggest at random, what may easily be polished into accuracy, perhaps loving generosity to "The Merchant of Venice," the kindly grace of nature to "As you like it," and justice (as its name implies) to "Measure for Measure." The last, indeed, one could almost fancy an allegory emblematic of the providential government of the world. And it is worth while observing this, though it is somewhat treading on our own footsteps, as one of the modes in which Shakspeare protests against the notion, that what is true deserves to be represented in poetry by mere virtue of that truth, that the poet's office is merely to hold a mirror up to nature. Taken in its full extent, this maxim would deprive the poet of all principles of selection. And few, we suppose, would so hold it, though many speak as if they did. Certain it is great poets have not been content with the homeless liberty which this inflicts upon them: they have not so deserted their vocation. They have used their keen insight into nature with boldness and energy,—but still *as an instrument*; an instrument by which to render intelligible to others those forms of ideal excellence which they felt to be the legitimate objects of admiration. Often, indeed, "the light that was in them was darkness." We know that many in our own and other ages have laboured to throw a poetical splendour over pride, revenge, sullen misanthropy, and voluptuousness. Such writings will indeed give little pleasure to minds of a different cast by the mere talent they exhibit. They will be too painful and revolting. That vicious notion of excellence which is such a poet's idol, may, and will in proportion to his power and originality, so consistently impress itself on his conceptions, his language, and even perhaps his rhythm, as to tinge them all with its own offensive character. But there has been a living spirit in what such men have done,

though it has been an evil spirit. They have been poets. Even vanity, with all its contemptible egotism, still leaves them poets, and if not an exclusive passion, perhaps great poets. Bad as they have been, they have done homage to the law which demanded of them not indiscriminately to reflect, but to be something and to be the preachers of something. We would venture to predict that it would be found no elusive task, though a most difficult one, no mere exercise of ingenuity, but a most true and important course of criticism, to extract from the writings of all our first poets, and to exhibit vividly and intelligibly that notion, not exactly of beauty, nor yet exactly of moral excellence, but rather perhaps of *the admirable*, which governed their thoughts and language. Few men would be equal to it; but the mere names of Shakspeare, Milton, Dryden, Burns, or to take a few prominent poets of our own day, of Wordsworth, Byron, Scott, and Moore, are by their mere recital almost enough to show the reality, as well as the interest and variety, which such a discussion would have.

On the whole, if what has been said is true, it amounts to this. We may admire poetry and take pleasure, a great deal of pleasure, in it for the sake of the art which it displays, as we might in a piece of mechanism; with such admiration as critics and practised connoisseurs make it their business to dispense. This is obviously not enough, we are here only pleased at observing a skilful adaptation of means to an end:—what is that end? And this critical admiration is a sadly meagre feeling in comparison with those which poetry is unquestionably capable of exciting:—what are those other feelings? Are they the excitement produced by a vigorous description of an eventful story, novel and true conceptions, or rich and fanciful imagery as such? There is certainly nothing self-contradictory in supposing that excitement, elevation, or whatever it is to be called, is the ultimate end of poetry, if people will allow that this is a real and adequate account of the highest kind of pleasure which they have felt from it. But, we believe, that those who are in the habit of trying to appreciate the inner meaning of poets will not allow this; we believe they will be conscious of having felt a still deeper kind of satisfaction, and one which bore the stamp of a higher authority in the sympathy they have found there, expanding and bearing evidence to all that their own feelings had told them, and often replacing a sense of insulation and peculiarity by an intelligent expectation of a wider communion with others. We believe that the expectation of this sympathy, whether from a large or from a small circle, from one friend or the whole world, is the poet's legitimate inspiration, egotistical only when he asks others

to feel *for* him, instead of *with* him ; when he writes for *admiration*, instead of sympathy ; and that in the bestowing and seeming to receive it is the truest pleasure which he enables each individual reader to enjoy. And we have attempted to show at some length the greatness of the end which this opens to him, no less than to educate and bless mankind by teaching them to sympathize with each other ; the peculiar capabilities in the nature of poetry which seem to mark it out as the proper instrument for this work ; and the power which by dint of these capabilities it does actually exercise. But it is time to proceed to the two poets on whose heads we have discharged this dissertation, hoping that it will be found to throw some light on our estimate of their merits.

What gives Mr. Trench's poems their charm, is their exceeding truth and reality ; he seems unable to write except from the bottom of his heart, and his poems have all that noble delicacy of expression, the chastened and reverent simplicity which springs from truth. Nothing is overdrawn. Whether his subject require majesty, or tenderness, or pathos, a spirit of thoughtful self-possession breathes ever through his rhythm and language, which is our warrant for delivering our minds unreservedly to him while we read, with a feeling of most delightful security, from all the exaggerated passion and exaggerated calmness, the elaborate conceits and prettinesses serving to convey nothing but themselves, which a charitable and patient reader wearies himself with sifting, analyzing, and reading backwards and forwards, in the fruitless hope of discovering here and there one or two unstudied indications of genuine feeling.

The volume before us has every appearance of being a most true reflection of the author's mind. He would seem possessed of warm poetical susceptibilities, but also, happily, of a deep and earnest heart ; and as such incapable of being permanently imposed on by those aimless emotions which any man of imagination may excite in himself, even to morbidness, by the mere survey of his own, perhaps picturesque, conceptions. He beautifully exhibits in his "Introductory Stanzas," the power and the helplessness of poetry, how little it can give to an anxious mind if earnestly seeking an adequate object for its perplexed feelings, while only (what some maintain it only should be) a *creation*, the evoking of a pageant which is to vanish,—snow companions which melt like Lailah's in the evening ; and how much, to him who breathes it forth as a voice expressive of those realities which he cannot otherwise communicate,—the thrilling touch by which others may be won, not merely to fancy his fancies or conceive his conceptions, but to fathom those truths which are his "peace and joy." Speaking as one who had sought in cherished poetical

feelings a refuge from disquieting thoughts, an answer to an enigma which he must read if he would be at rest, he proceeds,—

“ Something thou spak'st, but nothing to my need,
So that I counted thee an idle thing,
Who, having promised much, could'st no true succour bring.

IV.

And I turned from thee, and I left thee quite ;
And of thy name to hear had little care :
For I was only seeking if by flight
I might shun her, who else would rend and tear
Me, who could not her riddle dark declare :—
This toil, the anguish of this flight was mine,
Until at last, inquiring everywhere,
I won an answer from another shrine,
An holier oracle, a temple more divine.

V.

But when no longer without hope I mourned,
When peace and joy revived in me anew,
Even from that moment my old love returned,
My former love, yet wiser and more true,
As seeing what for us thy power can do,
And what thy skill can make us understand
And know—and where that skill attained not to ;
How far thou canst sustain us by thy hand,
And what things shall in us a holier care demand.

VI.

My love of thee and thine—for earth and air,
And every common sight of sea and plain,
Then put new robes of glory on, and wear
The same till now, and things which dead had lain
Revived, as flowers that smell the dew and rain :
I was a man again of hopes and fears,
The fountains of my heart flowed forth again,
Whose sources had seemed dry for many years,
And there was given me back the sacred gift of tears.

VII.

And that old hope, which never quite had perished,
A longing which had stirred me from a boy,
And which in darkest seasons I had cherished—
Which nothing could quite vanquish or destroy—
This with all other things of life and joy
Revived within me—and I too would seek
The power, that moved my own heart, to employ
On others, who perchance would hear me speak,
If but the tones were true, although the voice were weak.

VIII.

Though now there seems one only worthy aim
 For poet,—that my strength were as my will!—
 And which renounce he cannot without blame—
 To make men feel the presence by his skill
 Of an eternal loveliness, until
 All souls are faint with longing for their home,
 Yet the same while are strengthened to fulfil
 Their work on earth, that they may surely come
 Unto the land of life, who here as exiles roam.

IX.

And what though loftiest fancies are not mine,
 Nor words of chiefest power, yet unto me
 Some voices reach out of the inner shrine,
 Heard in mine heart of hearts, and I can see
 At times some glimpses of the majesty,
 Some prints and footsteps of the glory trace,
 Which has been left on earth, that we might be
 By them led forward to the secret place,
 Where we perchance might see that glory face to face."

Mr. Trench will not degrade poetry to any lower purpose. Hence, it has been said, his great charm, and hence perhaps his defect, which is a want of freedom and elasticity. His poetry aspires to embody that which lies deepest in his own heart; and it might be fancied that he had aimed at pruning off so vigorously all that he did not know to be in good faith there, or that being there savoured of frivolous levity, as to have debarred himself from that healthy play of the fancy which is to the poet what games and festivities are to youth,—though a most unworthy end, yet an expanding and invigorating education, of its varied powers. If this has been the case, the result has been something of a loss. Perhaps, indeed, the loss has been more than compensated. If freedom was to be bought at the expense of one atom of that calm serious beauty which pervades the volume, we could not wish things otherwise than they are. But we cannot help thinking that they must have co-existed to a greater extent. It may be unfair to judge, that what a poet has not chosen to introduce into a duodecimo of 180 pages, not professing a miscellaneous character, he does not possess; but in this case the omissions have a characteristic appearance. There is no playfulness in the volume—there is nothing indicating a discriminating view of human character—nothing which shows a painter's eye—judging from this volume it would be quite correct to say, that Mr. Trench loved nature, not quite so to say that he was remarkably alive to natural beauty as such. Scenery, we should guess, would

interest him not as introducing him to new and surprising forms of grace and grandeur, but as a kind of seal and evidence to certain thoughts which his mind had previously dwelt on; an effect which might happen to be produced by the most ordinary, nearly or quite as well as by the most beautiful sight. What we have said of scenery we should expect to find true, *mutatis mutandis*, of intellectual truth and human character. We should expect to find Mr. Trench uninterested by them, except so far as he distinctly appreciated in them a moral or religious element. Hence, we should say, his omissions; and hence (for we are not left to mere negative evidence against him) some few poems in which graphic spirit might fairly be expected as "Harmosan," "Sabbatun" and others, are far less successful than those in which the author's personal feelings seem to be more distinctly embodied. And the converse of our accusation is certainly true; that, as it is not Mr. Trench's nature to do justice to that which is unconnected with his deeper feelings, so a valuable thought, which is connected with them, he sometimes puts into metre, though it really has not a fair claim to stand as poetry, but would be more appropriately placed in a "golden grove," or "sacra privata." Some of the "Century of Couplets" are, we think, liable to this objection.

xxxv.

"If humble, next of thy humility beware,
And lest thou should'st grow proud of such a grace have care.

xxvii.

Despise not little sins—for mountain high may stand
The piled heap made up of smallest grains of sand."

It is possible that in many positions these might become poetical, but they want a position to make them so; as many of Hamlet's beautiful reflections when torn off and quoted piecemeal, without the colouring which his character sheds on them, sink into apophthegms. We are ready to believe that when Mr. Trench is become a more voluminous writer, and his readers consequently better acquainted with him and his mode of feeling the truths which he so nakedly puts forth, his mere enunciation of them may be sufficient to effect the same purpose; in the meantime certainly *hæremus*.

In all these respects his present volume differs somewhat from his first. It is more concentrated: Mr. Trench seems to have found more completely his own appropriate form of expression, and to confine himself to it. His step is firmer and more collected, his meaning more undiluted, the flow of his poetry more strong and deep, with that tinge of chastened severity which was

perhaps wanting to make his former volume all that religious poetry ought to be. But still he has lost in glow and variety. Perhaps this loss may be a necessary condition of the gain;—if it is so, we need not complain, for it is far more than compensated. We repeat we would not sacrifice one jot of serious earnestness to gain or regain the power of a vivid description, the discriminating perception of external beauty, the play of which we yet feel the absence. But we do not think it need be sacrificed, nor does Mr. Trench. He would agree with us in thinking that physical and intellectual Beauty are to natural religion, in some respects, what incomprehensible Truths are to revealed. We cannot tell its bearings, we cannot tell why it should exercise over our feelings that power which it does exercise, (else what do we mean by the word?) and with something approaching to the authority of conscience, any more than we can tell why mysteries are given us by the word of God. Yet He has affixed to each in its appropriate place its own sufficient evidence, nor in either case can we venture to say how we may be maiming our conceptions of Him, by neglect of the present means which he has given us of enlarging our hearts and minds to His knowledge, whether through the words of his messengers, or through the varied reflexions of His greatness, which he has enabled us to recognize. If even our humility is a shadow of some adorable attribute of His, which the great fact of the Christian dispensation evidences, what may not be so? But Mr. Trench's own words shall speak for himself and us. We shall be easily pardoned for lengthening our extract beyond what is to our present purpose.

“ Have we left

Our love for nature, now to love her less,
 Now we have learned that all we so admire
 Is yet but as her soiled and week-day dress,
 And nothing to the glory she shall wear,
 When for the coming Sabbath of the world
 She shall put on her festival attire—
 Or closed our hearts to what of beautiful
 Man by strong spell and earnest toil has won
 To take intelligible forms of art,
 Now that all these are recognized to be
 Desires and yearnings, feeling after Him,
 And by Him only to be satisfied,
 Who is Himself the eternal Loveliness.

Has it been so with us, that men should say,
 That they should say with reason we have now
 Narrowed our hearts, forsaken our old joy
 In Nature, or renounced the glorious hope
 That once we cherished for the race of man?

That hope, that joy, that longing. still are ours,
And shall continue with us to the end,
Else better not to be. True is it, we walk
Under the shadow of such mysteries,
That how should they not darken us sometimes ?
And how in such a mournful world as this
Should Love be other than a sorrowing thing,
A call to grieve ? for though its golden key
Sets open to us a new world of joys,
Yet has it griefs and sorrows of its own ;
Making things grievous that we once could bear
To look at with a careless tearless eye."—pp. 151—153.

We ought not, however, to forget that one of the most beautiful of his poems, Honor Neale, from which we only do not quote because we fear to do it injustice by selecting portions, shows very different powers, being as faultless and as keenly touching a specimen of simple homely pathos as we ever remember to have read. With this mention, and one more extract, breathing all over the deep unexcited fervour which is characteristic of the volume, our readers will have a pretty accurate notion of the style of poetry in which Mr. Trench feels himself at home.

" If there had any where appeared in space
Another place of refuge where to flee,
Our hearts had taken refuge in that place,
And not with thee.

" For we against creation's bars had beat
Like prisoned eagles, through great worlds had sought
Though but a foot of ground to plant our feet,
Where thou wert not.

" And only when we found in earth or air,
In heaven or hell that such might no where be,
That we could not flee from thee any where,
We fled to thee."

Mr. Milnes's poetry stands in remarkable contrast with Mr. Trench's. If his volume gives us a true notion of its writer, a sonnet in the Memorials, beautiful and very true to nature, in itself, is so amusingly characteristic of him that we cannot resist extracting it *in limine*.

" I love the forest ;—I could dwell among
That silent people, till my thoughts up grew
In nobly-ordered form, as to my view
Rose the succession of that lofty throng :—
The mellow footstep on a ground of leaves
Formed by the slow decay of numerous years,—
The couch of moss, whose growth alone appears,
Beneath the fir's inhospitable eaves,—

The chirp and flutter of some single bird,—
 The rustle in the brake,—what precious store
 Of joys have these on poets' hearts conferred?
 And then at times to send one's own voice out,
 In the full frolic of *one* startling shout,
 Only to feel the after-stillness more!"—p. 5.

We find everywhere the working of a rich and active fancy; a warm and susceptible mind readily impressed by all the varied forms, not only of natural beauty but of affectionate feeling. There is a graphic energy, a free play about his poems which is exactly what we have accused Mr. Trench of wanting. But they are constantly suggesting to us that the feelings of which they are the result are more lively than deep; such as the author would not much care to expel or intrude upon by "the full frolic of one startling shout." They are not unaffected. Mr. Milnes easily conceives a feeling, and too readily gives himself credit for being possessed by it. The consequence is, that in many very striking poems we are met by a most provoking mixture of what has the touchingness and much of the simplicity of truth, with what is very glaring and artificial, of life and beauty with unreality. He is apt to forget on these occasions that true feeling is simple: that even when it most preys upon itself, analyzing, tormenting, probing what least bears the touch, contemplating and repining at what should be combated, it shrinks, so long as it is true, from expatiating on the results of its painful analysis. It *allows itself to be seen*, does not protrude itself, colour, explain, and illustrate. And if it does force itself, like Washington Irving's Italian, to paint the hideous phantom which haunts it, least of all does it frame, glaze, and send it to the Exhibition. We must avow there is, to us, a kind of self-contradictory absurdity in all those definite statements of strong feeling, morbid misery, and so on, thrown into the first person, which are inflicted on us remorselessly by the "lay-it-on-thick" school of poetry. They condemn their authors at best of unreality, at worst of swaggering sentimentalism, uncravatted and unprincipled; and we do wish Mr. Milnes had shown them no favour. The strained manner, however, of which this is part, pervades too many of his compositions, though in very different degrees: generally, and most strongly, as may be supposed, when he attempts to paint deep and powerful feelings from imagination, as in "The World's Exile," "The Lay of the Humble," "Lines to Myrrha," "Two Visits to a Grace," and many nameless poems. We are far from denying the poetical skill and power which several of them display; but, to our feelings their overwrought tone more than counterbalances their merit of this kind. On the other hand, in some poems where the feelings

embodied are of a lighter kind, or only used as a basis for rich or wild ornament, he is enabled to give his fancy free play, without at all exceeding the licence which is allowed to such efforts. So, too, where his lines are suggested by a plain, manly, moral feeling, or by events so personally touching as to bring home to him the impiety of morbidness or extravagance, he writes with a seriousness and absence of display which we wish were invariably to be found in his poems. There is a rich sweetness, almost unalloyed, about the following stanzas on a lady in declining health.

“ Gently supported by the ready aid
Of loving hands, whose little work of toil
Her grateful prodigality repaid
With all the benediction of her smile,
She turned her failing feet
To the soft-pillowed seat,
Dispersing kindly greetings all the while.

* * * * *

“ There seemed to lie a weight upon her brain,
That ever prest her blue-veined eyelids down,
But could not dim her lustrous eyes with pain,
Nor seam her forehead with the faintest frown ;
She was as she were proud,
So young, to be allowed
To follow Him who wore the thorny crown.

“ Nor was she sad, but over every mood,
To which her lightly-pliant mind gave birth,
Gracefully changing, did a spirit brood,
Of quiet gaiety, and serenest mirth ;
And thus her voice did flow
So beautifully low,
A stream whose music was no thing of earth.”—p. 64.

A stanza, indeed, which we omit, at the end, is a blot ; but in poems of this personal character, even if the author is sometimes inconsistent with his better self, we gladly acquiesce in the prohibition to criticize with which he closes another composition.

“ It is the homage of a kinsman's grief
Written for kindred ; nor has other claim :
They will inform the vague imperfect frame
With inward-flowing music of their own,
The melodies of mournful recollections,
The supplement of personal interest,
The sympathies that come far out to meet you,
And other judgment I acknowledge none.”

But to return to poems which may be more legitimately dis-

cussed; the following extracts are taken from a group with which the volume of *Poems* opens, on Youth and Childhood.

“ Youth, that pursuest with such eager pace
 Thy even way,
 Thou pantest on to win a mournful race;
 Then stay! oh, stay!
 Pause and luxuriate in thy sunny plain;
 Loiter,—enjoy:
 Once past, thou never wilt come back again,
 A second boy.
 The hills of manhood wear a noble face,
 When seen from far;
 The mist of light from which they take their grace
 Hides what they are.
 The dark and weary path those cliffs between
 Thou canst not know,
 And how it leads to regions never-green,
 Dead fields of snow.
 Pause, while thou mayst, nor deem that fate thy gain,
 Which, all too fast,
 Will drive thee forth from this delicious plain,
 A man at last.”—p. 7.

The next lines are from a poem called the *Flight of Youth*—a half playful complaint that

“ — he never will come back
 Never again — ”

and seem to us to be thrown off with a great deal of picturesque grace.

“ Bow your heads very low,
 Solemn-measured be your paces,
 Gathered up in grief your faces,
 Sing sad music as ye go;
 In disordered handfuls strew
 Strips of cypress, sprigs of rue;
 In your hands be borne the bloom,
 Whose long petals once and only
 Look from their pale-leaved tomb
 In the darkness lonely;
 Let the nightshade's beaded coral
 Fall in melancholy moral
 Your wan brows around,
 While in very scorn ye fling
 The amaranth upon the ground
 As an unbelieved thing;
 What care we for its fair tale
 Of beauties that can never fail,

Glories that can never wane ?
No such blooms are on the track
He has past, who will come back
Never again !"—p. 11.

This volume expresses itself to be "Of many years and many moods;" and these two extracts, though beautiful in their way, are of a somewhat discontented one. We will hope that it has been displaced by the more healthy tone of "Youth's fair Resolve," which is a conclusion of good omen to the group.

"Let us go forth and resolutely dare
With sweat of brow to toil our little day—
And if a tear fall on the task of care,
In memory of those spring hours past away
Brush it not by !
Our hearts to God ! to brother men
Aid, labour, blessing, prayer, and then
To these a sigh."

These extracts, however, are somewhat disjointed: a longer one will, probably, give a fairer notion of the author. The one which we select, though tinged with his characteristic defect, appears to us an evidence of no ordinary poetical ability.

"THE MARVEL OF LIFE.

"O LIFE ! how like the common-breathèd air,
Which is thy outward instrument, thou liest
Ever about us, with sustaining force,
In the calm current of our usual days
Unfelt, unthought of ; nay, how dense a crowd
Float on upborne by thy prolific stream,
E'n to the ridges of th' eternal sea,
Spending profuse the passion of their mind.
On every flower that gleams on either bank,
On every rock that bends its rugged brow,
Conscious of all things, only not of thee.
Yet some there are, who in their greenest youth,
At some rare hours, have known the dazzling light
Intolerable, that glares upon the soul,
In the mere sense of Being, and grown faint
With awe, and striv'n to press their folded hands
Upon their inner eyes, and bowed their heads,
As in the presence of a mighty Ghost,
Which they must feel, but cannot dare to see.
It is before me now, that fearful truth,
That single solitary truth, which hangs
In the dark heaven of our uncertainties,
Seen by no other light than its own fire,

Self-balanced, like the Arab Magian's tomb,
 Between the inner and the outer world ;—
 How utterly the wretched shred of time,
 Which in our blindness we call human life,
 Is lost with all its train of circumstance,
 And appanage of after and before,
 In this eternal present ; that we Are !
 No When,—no Where,—no How,—but that we Are,—
 And nought besides ;—nor when our dazèd sight,
 Weaned from its first keen wonder, learns to fix
 The surer and more reasonable gaze
 Of calm concentrated philosophy
 On this intense idea, have we gained
 One instant's raising of the sacred veil,
 One briefest glimpse into the sanctuary.—
 We grasp at words, and find them meaningless,
 Bind thoughts together that will not be bound,
 But burst asunder at the very time
 We hold them closest,—find we are awake
 The while we seem to dream, and find we dream
 The while we seem to be the most awake ;
 And thus we are thrown on from sea to sea.
 Can we take up the sparkles of choice light,
 That dance upon the ruffled summer waters,
 And make them up to one coherent sun ?
 Can we transform the charred and molten dust
 Into its elemental diamond ?
 And, tho' thus impotent, we yet dare hope,
 From this embasèd form, half earth, half heaven,
 Of most imperfect fragmentary nature,
 These scant materials of dethronèd power,
 This tarnished beauty, marred divinity,
 To fabricate a comprehensive scheme
 Of absolute existence—to lay open
 The knowledge of a clear concordant whole,
 And penetrate, with foully-scalèd eyes,
 The total scope and utmost distances,
 Of the creations of the Living God."—p. 117.
 * * * * *

Let this be a specimen of Mr. Milnes's mode of throwing his
 mind upon a great thought. It will illustrate all we have said
 to place by the side of it a parallel, but very different poem,
 of Mr. Trench's, certainly one of the most beautiful in his
 volume.

“ THE DAY OF DEATH.

Thou inevitable day,
 When a voice to me shall say—
 ‘Thou must rise and come away ;

All thine other journeys past,
Gird thee and make ready fast
For thy longest and thy last.'
Day deep-hidden from our sight
In impenetrable night,
Who may guess of thee aright ?
Art thou distant, art thou near ?
Wilt thou seem more dark or clear ?
Day with more of hope or fear ?
Wilt thou come, not seen before
Thou art standing at the door,
Saying, light and life are o'er ?
Or with such a gradual pace,
As shall leave me largest space
To regard thee face to face ?
Shall I lay my drooping head
On some loved lap, round my bed
Prayer be made and tears be shed ?
Or at distance from mine own,
Name and kin alike unknown,
Make my solitary moan ?
Will there yet be things to leave,
Hearts to which this heart must cleave,
From which parting it must grieve ?
Or shall life's best ties be o'er,
And all loved things gone before
To that other happier shore ?
Shall I gently fall on sleep,
Death-like slumber o'er me creep,
Like a slumber sweet and deep ?
Or the soul long strive in vain
To get free, with toil and pain
From its half divided chain ?
Little skills it where or how,
If thou comest then or now,
With a smooth or angry brow ;
Come thou must, and we must die—
Jesus, Saviour, stand thou by,
When that last sleep seals our eye."—p. 99.

There can be little doubt that the first of these poems is the most brilliant. Those who are attracted by rich imagery, by a rapid and bounding torrent of thought and language, and a bold animated conception of greatness, must recognise these in no ordinary degree in Mr. Milnes's lines. They are far more calcu-

lated to attract *admiration* ; with very much of truth, they display perhaps more, strictly speaking, of poetical *talent*. One or two bursts are really magnificent. But there is a deep authority, a moral power in the calm unhurried spirit with which the poet fixes his eye on the "Day of Death," which even in point of poetical merit is of a higher order than talent. Every expression seems to flow calmly and immediately from the heart—whereas about Mr. Milnes's poem an effort is perceptible—though one, it must be said, which is not in all places displeasing, or much so here. It seems as if he were not uttering his heart, but had worked up his imagination and wrote from it ; not so much perhaps *impressed*, as *seeing vividly how he might be impressed* by the beauty and grandeur of the thoughts which he evokes. In poems distinctly of the imagination this is of course more or less an appropriate state of mind ; not so however where the writer claims the higher, far higher office of "diffusing what has sprung up freshly and purely in his own moral being."—(*Preface.*) It then at least becomes an inconsistency, which is the legitimate object of criticism. This is most unpleasantly the case with Mr. Milnes when he ought to be most in earnest—when, that is, he touches on the direct objects of religious veneration. But on this point something should be said. The author seems to have received many of his religious impressions from Rome and Roman Catholics ; to have been led to a higher appreciation of religion by feeling keenly the grandeur of the outward form which it there assumes, both in her solemnities, and in the entire devotion which the higher arts pay to her. He recurs with admiration to the days preceding the Augustan age of modern Italy, when this was more real and indeed exclusive. Days when painters

" never moved their hand
Till they had steeped their inmost soul in prayer."

Mem. p. 93.

and were exalted in return to infuse into their art a deep principle of life which showed its power by producing Raffaele and Titian, and its origin by melting in their very hands * when they dared to paint their mistresses. This state of things, when religion absorbs or groups round itself all that is beautiful and

* The following is a note of Mr. Milnes's :—*Mem.* p. 74. "The decline of pure religious feeling in art at Vienna may perhaps be most accurately dated from the influence of Aretino over Titian ; up to that time he had hardly ever painted a *profane* subject, and no other artist ever seems to have thought of it." The degradation was not so sudden as "in the Roman school from Raffaele to Giulio Romano, and in the Bolognese from Francia to Guido ; but too soon came the younger Palma and his followers, the Caracci of the Venetians."—The decline of the whole art from that time forth every body knows.

imposing, he recognizes as rightful. Rightful it is—but it has its obvious dangers. Where religion is so very beautiful, men are much tempted to forget that it is more. We contemplate on the threshold, instead of entering to obey. And if the element of self-control is left out of religious feeling, if the divine economy is felt as affecting only, not commanding, as a wonderful phenomenon, not the voice of a ruler, it will soon be treated as other phenomena. Our impressions of beauty will not rise into religion, but religion will subside into them,—will become, not an end, but an effective subject for art; and we shall feel at liberty to handle, dissect, criticize, and illustrate sacred things with all the freedom of touch, which we apply to what is merely beautiful. Something of this is often discernible in persons who have been in the way of seeing the great facts of Christianity made the constant subjects of art; and perhaps most people, when they rationally consider the frame of mind in which they are apt to look at a sacred picture, (say, in an exhibition,) or to hear sacred music, (say, at a concert,) will find some reason to be dissatisfied with themselves in this respect. In Italy the temptation must be almost overpowering; and to Mr. Milnes it has been quite so. He is apt to touch holy things without awe. He can appreciate this feeling, he can describe glowingly its beauty and appropriateness, but it is not in his heart, else it would be to him, what it is in itself, a *prohibitory* feeling. He feels no difficulty at introducing sacred words and associations merely to give a kind of force and poignancy to his phrases, which really, in its broader form, (as

“Dear God! how wondrous that, &c.”

or

“had the unnatural bondage of a school
Blasphemed the Godhead of thy vernal years,”)

is but a more civilized kind of swearing—“shotting his discourse, as the worthy captain was wont to call it.” And even when it confines itself to using, for ordinary purposes, phrases which have somewhat of a consecrated meaning, as applying to Raffaele, Poussin, and their brother painters, merely as such, the term “glorified society,” it is, we think, if intended, an ill-judged mode of gaining strength, and unworthy of a writer who has Mr. Milnes’s resource. Again, he speaks of an infant’s likeness to a picture “of the God-boy who slumbered in the manger,” and seems to find a pleasure in this kind of bold simile and unchastened language. But the poems of Mr. Milnes which most offend in this respect are among the “Pictures in Verse,” translations, as it were, into poetry of different remarkable sacred pic-

tures, in which this loose artist-like way of dealing with them has most opportunity of displaying itself. It is difficult to judge of these compositions fairly without knowing the pictures which they profess to represent, and of the author, without allowing fairly for that unreal tone of mind which an exposure to the sensual attractions of Romanism is likely to generate, particularly if unchecked by a submission to its asceticism. Still there is much, which cannot be excused, under the largest allowances; a rude and indelicate particularity which is boldly applied where rudeness is least pardonable. He forgets that he is describing, not a picture only, but a reality—that he is inventing feelings for those whose hearts evangelists would have shrunk from exposing. But we shall best exemplify the feeling which we should have desired to find in poems of this kind, by simply extracting a few stanzas from a poem of Mr. Trench's, almost translated from a legend of the middle ages, which he gives in a note. The conduct and language of this story exhibit, far more vividly than we can explain, the kind of transparent veil which a reverent mind loves to throw between itself and the object of its contemplation. The noble "Gertrude of Saxony," on her way to an Alsatian convent, from her eagerness in pressing forward, finds herself and her party benighted on a moor—suddenly they see a palace, with doors and windows open—and enter, but being able to find no inmate,

"for awe
And secret fear well nigh were tempted to withdraw.

VI.

But when they for a season waited had,
Behold! a matron of majestic air,
Of regal port, in regal garments clad,
Entered alone—who, when they would declare
With reverence meet what need had brought them there
At such untimely hour, smiling replied,
That she already was of all aware;
And added, she was pleased and satisfied
That they to be her guests that night had turned aside.

VII.

And ere the meal she spread for them was done,
Upon a sudden one there entered there,
Whose countenance with marvellous beauty shone,
More than the sons of men divinely fair,
And all whose presence did the likeness wear
Of angel more than man—he too, with bland
Mild words saluted them and gracious air;
Sweet comfort, solemn awe, went hand in hand,
While in his presence did those wondering pilgrims stand.

VIII.

Then turning to that matron, as a son
Might to a mother speak familiarly,
He spake to her—they only heard the tone,
Not listening, out of reverent courtesy :
And then with smile of large benignity
Saluting them again, he left the place,
And was not more seen by them—only she,
That matron, stayed and talked with them a space,
Whose words were full of sweetness and of heavenly grace.”—p. 58.

The next morning they proceed on their journey, and turning to look back, find the palace has vanished ; and on inquiry, hear from the people of the country that none such has ever been known on that place.

XII.

“ Thereat from them did thankful utterance break,
And with one voice they praised his tender care
Who had upreared a palace for their sake,
And of that pomp and cost did nothing spare,
Though but to guard them from one night’s cold air—
And had no ministeries of love disdained ;
And ’twas their thought, if some have unaware
Angels for guests received with love unfeigned,
That they had been by more than angels entertained.”

We do not know whether these extracts will give our readers the same impression which the whole poem leaves on the mind. It appears to us to embody the very spirit of unpresuming faith, shrinking timidly from imposing a hasty interpretation on the favours which it has received from God, or asserting positively what He has left only probable, yet not less grateful or less believing, for its silence. Let this be contrasted with the lines which in Mr. Milnes’s hands, that child, “ the prophet of the Highest,” who leapt in the womb for joy at the voice of the mother of his Lord, addresses to his Saviour.

“ JESUS AND JOHN CONTENDING FOR THE CROSS.

“ *The Child John trying to take the Cross out of the hand of Jesus.*

“ Give me the Cross I pray you, dearest Jesus !
Oh ! if you knew how much I wish to have it,
You would not hold it in your hand so tightly :
Something has told me—something in my heart here,
Which I am sure is true,—that if you keep it—
If you will let no other take it from you,—
Terrible things I cannot bear to think of,
Must fall upon you ; show me that you love me ;
Am I not here to be your little servant,
Follow your steps and wait upon your wishes ?

Why may I not take up the heavy plaything,
 And on my shoulder carry it behind you ?
 Then I am older, stronger too, than you are ;
 I am a child of the desert and the mountains ;—
 Deep i'the waste, I shouted at the wild bees,—
 They flew away and left me all the honey :
 Look at the shaggy skin I've tied about me,
 Surely if pain or any other evil
 Somewhere about this mystery be hidden,
 I am the fittest of the two to suffer !”

This is not childlike love, but childish familiarity, into which the original notion of the picture, beautiful if reverently treated, introduces itself about as harmoniously as a crucifix into a fashionable boudoir. It is wonderful, feeling apart, that even Mr. Milnes's perceptions of beauty did not preserve him from such a composition. One would have supposed that mere intellect would have told any one, even an infidel, that awe would be an ingredient in the feeling with which St. John the Baptist should be made to address our Saviour ; if at least he intended in any degree to conform to the spirit of those Scriptures from which he took his subject : and certainly in the poem we have quoted, it is not very easy to discover any trace of such a feeling. But we will not take our leave of Mr. Milnes in a bad humour, and shall be sorry if our readers do so ; and accordingly will close our extracts with a somewhat long one, the seriousness and grace of which are disfigured by none of the reckless tricks of the trade. It is a pity only that the scriptural illustration of tradition is not as accurate as it is beautiful.

It is said, that on reading in the New Testament the account of our Saviour's last supper and agony, Charlemagne was seized by a strong desire to discover the music of that hymn which Christ and his disciples then sung. The consequent story we shall give in Mr. Milnes's words :

“ . . . first he called to counsel in the hall
 Wise priests of reverend name,
 And with an open countenance, to all
 Declared his hope and aim.
 He said ‘ It is God's pleasure that my will
 ‘ Is made the natural law
 ‘ Of many nations, so that out of ill
 ‘ All good things I may draw.
 ‘ Therefore this holy mission I decree,
 ‘ Sparing no pains or cost,
 ‘ That thus those sounds of dearest memory
 ‘ Be not for ever lost.’

They spake, ' Tradition streameth thro' our race,
' Most like the whistling gentle air
' To which of old Elias veiled his face,
' Conscious that God was there.

' Not in the storm, the earthquake, and the flame,
' That troubled Horeb's brow,
' The splendour and the power of God then came,
' Nor thus he cometh now.

' The silent water filtereth thro' the earth,
' One day to bless the summer land,
' The word of God in man slow bubbleth forth,
' Tought by a worthy hand.

' Thus in the memory of some careful Jew
' May lurk the record of a tune,
' Wont to be sung in ceremonial due,
' After the Paschal noon.

' And thy deep yearning for this mystic song
' May give mankind at last
' Some charm and blessing that has slept full long
' The slumber of the past.'

The king rejoined, and at this high behest
Men to all toil and change inured,
Past out to search the world, if east or west,
That legend still indured.

What good or ill those venturous hearts befel,
What glory or what shame—
How far they wandered, I have not to tell,
Each has his separate fame.

I only know that when the weight of hours
The prime of mortal heads had bowed,
He, slowly letting go his outward powers,
Spoke from his couch aloud.

' My soul has wasted many a lingering year,
' To taste that one delight,
' And now I know at last that I shall hear,
' The hymn of Christ to-night.

' Look out good friends ! be prompt to welcome home,
' Straight to my presence bring
' My messengers who hither furnisht come,
' The song of Christ to sing.'

Dark sank that night, but darker rose the morn
That found the western earth
Of the divinest presence stript and shorn
It ever woke to birth.

It seemed beyond the common lawful sway
Of death and nature o'er our kind,
That such a one as he should pass away,
And aught be left behind.

In Aachen abbey's consecrated round,
Within the hallowed stone,
They placed the imperial body, robed and crowned,
Seated as on a throne.

While the Blest Spirit holds communion free
With that eternal quire,
Of which on earth to trace the memory,
Was his devout desire."

We need say little more of Mr. Trench or Mr. Milnes, except to wish them well in their career. About the first of these gentlemen we need have little misgiving. He has found his line, and feels all the realities of his position; when that is the case, men are not apt to fall away. His style may issue in something altogether different from what we see, or it may only mature; still there is a heart in his poetry which will remain one and the same—and in truth we should ourselves be surprised at any marked alteration even in its external character. He may never become a popular poet; ten years ago he would have been voted insufferably tame—many perhaps will think him so now; and some minds are unquestionably so constituted, that by no means could they be led to perceive that he was any thing else. But whether generally admired or not, a poet who represents with singular grace and majesty some of the best and deepest feelings of our nature, will not want *some* admirers in every age, and the affection which the few will bear to his writings will not be lessened because the many will not understand them. Prospects, however, do in fact look more promising; the chastened and thoughtful cast of feelings which Mr. Trench represents, are becoming day by day more appreciated among us; people are sick of the Byron school and all that savours of it, and long for truth and repose. And in this state of things we should not wonder to see Mr. Trench's present and future compositions become as generally, as they certainly will be deeply, admired.

Of Mr. Milnes we must speak more indefinitely. It is said that original minds, before striking forward on their appointed course, are obliged to go through a certain number of preparatory oscillations: that their earlier compositions are sacrifices, as it were, to the various circumstances or masters by which they are being formed. Mr. Milnes still oscillates; he is not various only, but inconsistent; he has not at present that dominant impelling force, without which no one yet gained and kept a high

rank among poets. We hope it will make its appearance in due time, and that a desire of display will not form an element in it. And we are willing to think it will be so. Setting aside Mr. Milnes's remarkable talents, which we should be most sorry to see wasted or abused, there is so much of kind feeling towards his friends, so much appreciation and admiration of what is good and noble, so much truth in his theory of a poet's vocation, so much, in spite of all that we have objected to, of religious intention in his poems, that we will not doubt that he will one day give those talents fair play, and take the place to which they entitle him. And with this hope "we wish him heartily farewell."

- ART. III.—1. *Isis Revelata: an Inquiry into the Origin, Progress, and present State of Animal Magnetism.* By J. C. Colquhoun, Esq., Advocate, F.R.S.E. Edinburgh. 1836.
2. *An Introduction to the Study of Animal Magnetism.* By the Baron Du Potet de Sennevoy. London. Saunders and Otley, Conduit Street. 1838.
3. *Animal Magnetism and Homœopathy.* By Edwin Lee, M.R.C.S. 1838.

MUCH attention has been recently directed to the revived subject of Animal Magnetism. Books have been written on it, and the public journals and reviews have thought it worth their notice. In London magnetising has been introduced into regular hospital practice; and in addition to these opportunities of examining it, a gentleman of the name of Du Potet has opened a room in Wigmore-street, where, for the small sum of half a crown, any one may witness the process from ten to four. It is not at all surprising that a theory of such pretensions, so full to ordinary minds of mysterious superstition and extravagance, should obtain numerous followers in the present day. Probably it will spread in a short time with much greater rapidity, and run into wilder excesses than are at present thought possible. There are always minds enough in the world, idle and restless in the absence of a healthy stimulus, who sit as it were with open mouths and wandering eyes ready to catch the first tale of wonder, and swell the chorus of exultation or alarm, and their numbers multiply in proportion to the general dryness, barrenness, and uninteresting character of the age. Luther's drunken peasant was a very fair image of man. You put him up on one side of his

horse and he tumbles down on the other. Thus nothing is more natural, than that an age of physical science, of cold selfish and materialized views, in which the existence of mind as mind seems almost forgotten, and the perfection of the moral, like that of the physical, world is conceived to be a mechanical movement—that such an age should blindly fall into the hands of the first professor of miracles and supernatural influences, who will venture to provide for them that sustenance of marvels which in some shape or another is necessary for the support of our moral life, and which man will greedily swallow even in the most corrupted form, if it is not ministered to him regularly in a sound and healthy diet. It is thus that an “uncouth superstition” is the natural growth of Atheism; and Animal Magnetism will probably raise up a formidable rival to physical science in some extravagant mysticism.

In making these remarks it is by no means intended to stigmatize the revival of this new art (for with all its pretensions it cannot be allowed the name of science) as pure delusion and absurdity. On the contrary, one of our first objects in alluding to it, is to protest against approaching any phenomenon of the kind in that sneering, incredulous, self-satisfied spirit, which set aside all evidence but sense, repudiates external testimony, answers facts by theories, limits the possibilities of nature by the experience almost of an individual, and thus even when, as may be the case, it advocates the cause of Christianity, provides as effectual an obstacle to the reception of the miracles of our Lord, as to the belief of extraordinary facts in the economy of nature. The subject has been less examined in England than on the Continent, and it will be impossible to treat it seriously, or with any appearance of belief without exciting contempt in many, who are ignorant of its history. But, however easy it may be to ridicule credulity, we cannot look at the list of upwards of eighty works which have been published on Magnetism, and have been selected by Mr. Colquhoun, or remember that, in his words, “they have all been written by gentlemen of education and intelligence, and by far the greater part of them by respectable, learned and eminent physicians,” without giving some credence to the phenomena attested, whatever may be thought of the theory on which they are explained.

A second consideration which presses on us, relates to those who are believers in magnetism. The singular appearances produced by magnetism have already been seized on by men, who know nothing of the real evidence of Christianity, as parallels to the miracles of the Bible, just as, in the first centuries of the Christian era, very similar phenomena were employed for the

same purpose by the resuscitated Pythagorean and Platonician schools. The attack may be carried still farther; and members of the Church must be reminded in time, of the spirit in which it is to be met and repelled. If this had been done properly in the very analogous case of Mr. Irving's delusions and the Unknown Tongues, there would probably have been fewer instances of extravagance, and of departures from the Catholic Church; especially in the case of zealous, pious, but not judicious clergymen.

There is one preliminary observation of no little importance. It is singular with what excited feelings, partly of alarm, partly of curiosity and expectation, any new developement of science is received in the present day. The sounder part of men seem to occupy their present systems both of philosophy and religion, as if they were only tenants at will, and every post might bring them a notice to quit. Every new fact is, like a new face under such circumstances, a source of disquietude and suspicion. A knock at the door produces palpitation of the heart. A strange footstep is heard, and according to their dispositions the anxious tenants either quietly prepare to surrender up their keys, or bustle about with a vain show of resistance, to lock themselves into a room of which the window remains open for the enemy, or to seize on some favourite piece of lumber with a most heroic resolution never to quit sight of it. Every thing is suspense and suspicion. There are, indeed, other minds wholly uninterested in preserving any positive system, very ignorant, and very easily duped, who gape with wonder and delight, not unmingled with occasional misgivings for their personal safety, on the grand raree-show of science with the pretensions and promises of its professors.

This class of minds must always form the great portion of society; and they must naturally be at the mercy of every new philosopher. Nothing but experience can open their eyes to the fallacy of new pretensions; and then, in all probability, they will fall back with no less ardour to abuse the very name of discovery, and to pelt and hoot its professors.

A third class, however, consists of the leaders in this intellectual movement; some of them men of intellect, and nothing else, and absorbed in its indulgence, as gamblers in play, or misers in making money; others, a very few, full of an ardent enthusiastic benevolence, and dreams of human perfection, to be realized in some coming age by some new and sudden blaze of knowledge. But by far the greater part are the men who make science the pretence for furthering very different views of personal aggrandizement and caprice. They resemble most the stock-jobbers

and speculators, who more immediately, and with less pretension, turn every fresh discovery into money, by building on it a new joint-stock company, and selling the shares. These men are constantly on the watch for the merest shadow of a new phenomenon, which may seem to contradict all facts, to unsettle principles, and encourage vague anticipations of coming changes. If a new bed of rock is brought to light, suspicion is thrown at once upon the first chapter of Genesis. If an insect is hatched by electricity, why may not man have been hatched without any intervention of a Creator? If shells or bones and pebbles are collected, it is for the purpose of denying a deluge. The brain is anatomized and laid bare, that man may be proved to consist of brain, and nothing else. Instincts of animals are traced till in their eyes human reason becomes instinct, and all men animals. The regularity of the heavenly bodies is made to argue their eternity; the developement of organized bodies, to supersede the necessity of a Providence; and the cases of Animal Magnetism are thus employed to balance the miracles of the Scripture, and to open a new blaze of wonders, which are to obscure all former superstitions, and destroy all existing belief.

What in the mean time has been the conduct of many sincere friends of religion? Have they not shown signs of timidity, very unlike the possessors of an impregnable post? Is there not a tendency to check and fetter science, as a father would prohibit a child from approaching a spot where he would discover something, which his father does not wish him to know? Have there not been attempts to suborn physical science as a reluctant witness to the truth—and that not even to the peculiar doctrines of Christianity, but to the very primer and grammar of religion, the Being of a God—as if men, who denied the Bible, would confess to a Bridgwater Treatise? Do not good men grasp far too eagerly and gladly at the concurrence of philosophy with revelation, at the means of reconciling an intractable fact with the letter of Scripture—with every fresh evidence adduced from the discoveries of the day, as if we had not sufficient already—as if evidence to the Word of God were a thing to be tolerated by a Christian, except as an additional condemnation for those who reject it, or as a sort of exercise and indulgence for a Christian understanding?

Most assuredly the position which is now occupied by the main body of the defenders of the truth, is any thing but satisfactory—any thing but safe. And it is this, far more than any progress or discoveries of science, whether in magnetism, or any other department, that renders the contest alarming. We do, indeed, require to be reminded how Moses conquered the Ama-

lekites,—not by joining in the battle, but by standing with his arms lifted up to heaven and praying; how Joshua overthrew Jericho—not by storming the walls, but by blowing the trumpets of the sanctuary; how Israel was saved in all its perils—not by trusting to the horses of Egypt, or the hosts of Assyria, still less by bribing Babylon with the gold of the temple—but “in quietness and confidence shall be your strength.” It is a hackneyed maxim, that truth has but one voice, and the Church one watchword. And till quietness and confidence be restored to our polemical theology, the cause of Christian truth has much to dread.

And here, again, as in every other question, wander wherever we will, there starts up the same grand fundamental law, by neglecting which we have fallen into our present danger, and by returning to which we may escape. How is it that “quietness and confidence” have been lost, but by shifting imperceptibly the ground and foundation of our belief? We have transferred it from testimony to argument, from persons to things, from others to ourselves, from faith to reason. The very best of the present race of Christians, even those most attached by habit to the Church, if asked why they believe in its doctrines, will answer because they are true. And so far there can be no dispute, for no one can believe what he holds to be false. The reason is but another form of the conclusion. It is good for nothing. But ask them why they believe it to be true, and of those who are able and willing to give a reason not one in a hundred will assign the right. The poor ignorant uninstructed peasant will probably come nearest to the answer of the Gospel. He will say, “because I have been told so by those who are wiser and better than myself. My parents told me so, and the Clergyman of the parish told me so; and I hear the same whenever I go to Church. And I put confidence in these persons, because it is natural that I should trust my superiors. I have never had reason to suspect that they would deceive me. I hear of persons who contradict and abuse them, but they are not such persons as I would wish to follow in any other matter of life, and therefore not in religion. I was born and baptized in the Church, and the Bible tells me to stay in the Church, and obey its teachers; and till I have equal authority for believing that it is not the Church of Christ, as it is the Church of England, I intend to adhere to it.”

Now, such reasoning as this will appear to this rational age very paltry and unsatisfactory: and yet the logic is as sound as the spirit is humble. And there is nothing to compare with it either intellectually, or morally, or religiously, in all the elaborate defences and evidences which would be produced from Paley and Grotius, and Sumner, and Chalmers, and still less from the

Bridgwater Treatises, which,—as if the God of the Bible were not the God of Nature, as if the peculiarities of Christianity were not also written legibly in the hieroglyphics of the physical world, or as if nothing of God could be proved from his works but his Creation and general Providence,—have studiously dropt from their pages all mention of the Gospel, and confined themselves to illustrate the existence of vague undefined power above us:* just as if Dr. Buckland, in exhuming one of his antediluvian skeletons, had exhausted his ingenuity in proclaiming that the owner of them must once have existed, instead of scrutinizing every bone, and showing their perfect analogy in habitude and formation and use with the anatomy of present races of animals. We beg most strongly to protest against any more such evidences of religion—against any evidences whatever which are to draw off men's minds from the true basis of their belief. There is a very ingenious process in architecture, by which the rotten foundations of a building are removed, and sound piles inserted in their stead. With no less ingenuity in Theology the very opposite work has been accomplished. The whole fabric of Catholic Christianity has been shifted bodily, and without awaking its inhabitants, from the sound old piles of authority on which its Founder placed it, to new fantastic props rotten in themselves, and half sawn through by those who framed them, and who are now waiting to see the crash. The old basis was indeed out of sight, and those who lived upon it felt rather than knew its value, and profited by its firmness without digging to examine its construction. The present is quite within view: up in the air; very fine, very delicate, and very frail. And we can explain the admirable structure of every part, and in the midst of the lecture the whole will tumble down. It is very true that we are to be able to give a reason for the faith that is in us. But this is no command to give a wrong reason. And it is a wrong reason, that is, an injudicious, an unscriptural, a faithless and wilful reason, however true and logically conclusive in itself, when we believe Christianity, not because the Church has told us, in recognition of her authority and in obedience to her commands as our lawful and natural superior, but because its doctrines are conformable to our own individual reason—its laws agreeable to our own personal moral feeling—the history of the Bible reconcilable with the history of Herodotus or Livy—its mysteries improved repetitions of the theories of Aristotle and Plato—its physical narrations borne out by appearances in stones and planets—its whole scheme precisely what we should expect

* It is no disparagement of the excellent authors of some of these Treatises, to find fault with an arrangement over which they had no control, and of which they can be considered only as witnesses.

from our knowledge and notions of the Deity. These are the reasons on which the reasoning portion of the religious world rest their religion at this day. That is, each man by himself trusts implicitly to his own view of the case. And if by chance his view is right he adheres to the Church, or rather not to the Church of which he knows nothing, but to the doctrines which the Church teaches. Just as if the crew of a man-of-war, out upon the high seas in the time of war, were to come before their commander, and boast of their faithful attachment to him, as something on which he might implicitly rely, because they all remained in the ship; one because he liked sailing, another because it was good for his health, a third because he liked the crew, a fourth because the wind was fair, and a fifth because he had no where else to go, and a sixth because he had not been flogged, and a seventh because there was nothing to do. When the fancy of the first had gone off, and the second felt sick, and the third had met a quarrel, and the fourth found himself in a storm, and the fifth reached the shore, and the sixth was to be punished for a fault, and the seventh had orders to prepare for battle, we suspect that the commander would feel uneasy at the prospect, and have preferred ejecting such a crew before they set sail, to trusting them in any moment of peril, or regarding them in any light but as self-willed, feeble, and worthless men, who only wanted opportunity to mutiny.

And the Church will do wisely and safely in looking on her rationalizing children with the same jealousy and distrust—with this distinction only, that as the Church has herself forgotten to teach loyalty and obedience, not fancied truth and wilful inclination, as the virtues and duties of her militant members, she must be prepared to bear with them for a time, till their duties have been set before them. Till this is done there can be neither quietness nor confidence. A man cannot rest without a resting place distinct from himself, nor feel confidence except in a power other and higher than his own. But when he appeals to the truth and reasonableness, and morality, and consistency of Christianity,—to any thing but testimony over which he exercises no control whatever,—he is after all only appealing to himself, to what seems true and reasonable and consistent to himself. Give him a new fact or change a passing feeling, and his whole scheme is deranged in a moment. Another standard is formed, and another class of truths, probably direct contradictions to his former principles, is now to be professed. And from this vacillation nothing can secure him. He does, indeed, for a time, persuade himself that the truth of his own fancy is the truth of universal nature, and his own inclination independent morality; just as the man in

the churchyard pinned himself to the ground by sticking his own knife through the skirts of his own coat, and there remained in passive consternation at the ghosts who were holding him down. But a very slight wrench will dispell the allusion.

“ And when,” in the words of Plato, “ this has been done often, and after putting implicit confidence in all our notions, and believing them all to be sound, and true, and trustworthy, we have found first this one false and worthless, and then another, and another, and those especially which were closest to our hearts and minds; at last after such frequent false steps we begin to hate them all alike, and to believe that nothing sound can be found any where in any one,—that all truth is a dream, and the universe like the Euripus in one perpetual flux, not resting even for a moment.”*

Against this there is but one security—*Testimony and Authority*, and if the Church will consent once more to take its stand here nothing can shake it.

Till another Church has been established, and stood for eighteen hundred years, there can be no argument against Christianity, or against any part of the Church's doctrine, sufficient to counter-balance the argument which we now have in its favour. Testimony, if the right ground of belief, is only to be overthrown by testimony; and all other objections, drawn from its inconsistency with supposed truth and facts, are to be met by the simple question, how can we know what is truth except by testimony—unless, indeed, the assurance and belief and conscience of the individual is in each case the proper criterion, and we once more establish the sophistical canon, that each individual man is the measure of all things.

It is really necessary to suggest such considerations to those timid minds which are alarmed at the progress and pretensions of our modern discoverers, and to the discoverers themselves who may be meditating attacks upon the Faith. And for those who with better intentions, but scarcely more judgment, rejoice in every hope of forcing science to witness to the Church, we may suggest the following anecdote.

The fact is said to have occurred at the battle of Waterloo. We will not profess to guarantee it, but it will serve as an illustration. While the Duke of Wellington with the utmost anxiety was reconnoitring with his glass, to see if he could discover any sign of the approach of the Prussians, a body of troops was observed in the distance, but whether Prussians or French it was impossible to distinguish. The intense interest and suspense of such a crisis may well be imagined. Every eye and telescope

* F. Phæd. p. 153. See also to the same effect a splendid passage in the Republic, book 7, p. 280.

was strained in the direction. Every heart was beating. When, all at once, a voice exclaimed, "Please your Grace, they are Prussians." "Who are you, Sir?" said the Duke, turning away with very unusual impatience, and not deigning to notice the interruption. "May it please your Grace," said an officer standing by, "that man is called Long-Sighted-Jack. He has, by far, the quickest eye in the army, and can distinguish objects at a great distance." The soldier was immediately called up, and declared that he could distinguish the Prussians by the tips of their feathers. The Duke made him come to his side, and kept him by him the rest of the day. Now, if we, the Christian Church, were in a similar position with the English general on that critical moment, in great anxiety and doubt, unable to distinguish between truth and falsehood, and without any evidence to guide us but conjecture in that awful battle which we are called on to fight, we also should be exceedingly obliged to any quick-visioned philosopher who could contribute the slightest particle of assurance to assist our belief. But *after* the Prussians had come up in the sight of all the forces, and were recognized by them all as Prussians by their dress, language, music, and especially by their falling on the French and pursuing them over the field of battle; if a man had come up to the Duke of Wellington with a sure and profound declaration that he had discovered them to be Prussians *by the tips of their feathers*, we suspect his reception would not have been cordial. We rather fancy that the poor man would have received a much sharper reprimand for his intrusion, than the Church unhappily is in the habit of giving to the Chymist, and Botanist, and Anatomist, and Geologist, and other Long-Sighted-Jacks (we must be pardoned the expression) of the present day, who, in the heat of the conflict, while the whole army of the Christian faith, comprising the hosts of eighteen centuries, is fighting with the Bible in their hands, come up gravely with a pebble or a butterfly, and beg to assure them of the truth of Christianity by their recognizing "*the tips of its feathers*." It is necessary to apologize for this long preface. But those who have made themselves best acquainted with the characters and opinions connected with the subject of Animal Magnetism, will best understand the necessity of some such warnings. We may now turn to the immediate question.

The main facts asserted by the present Professors of Magnetism may be conveniently reduced to the following four:—

1. That there is a state in which the mind exists, more or less detached from the senses, and incapable of being affected by them; and that in this state a variety of remarkable phenomena are exhibited by it.

2. That this state may be produced not only by a morbid condition of the nervous system, but by the agency of other minds.

3. That this agency depends on an act of volition.

4. That it is carried on through the medium of a fluid analogous to, if not the same, with the Electrical and Magnetic currents.

The phenomena perceived in the magnetic state are usually divided by German writers into six stages.

In the first, the person magnetized is sensible of a strong perfusion from the head to the extremities. The temperature of the body increases, the skin becomes red, and there is a general sense of ease and lightness, such as is described by travellers to follow the application of the Egyptian baths.

The second stage is that of half sleep, the sensations already described become more intense, accompanied with a radiation of warmth from the stomach. The pulse is fuller and the breathing slower and deeper. Heaviness in the eyelids succeeds, until it is difficult to open them when once closed. Luminous appearances in the eyes, pricking in the fingers, rigour, spasms, and cramp, and other nervous sensations, follow.

The third stage is that of magnetic sleep, in which the patient becomes wholly insensible. In this stage, according to the Baron du Potet,* the surface of the body is sometimes acutely sensible, but more frequently the sense of feeling is absolutely annihilated; the jaws are firmly locked, and resist every effort to wrench them open; the joints are often rigid, and the limbs inflexible; and not only is the sense of feeling, but the senses of smell, hearing, and sight also, are so deadened to all external impressions, that no pungent odour, loud report, or glare of light can excite them in the slightest degree. The body may be pricked, pinched, lacerated or burnt; fumes of concentrated liquid ammonia may be passed up the nostrils; the loudest reports suddenly made close upon the ear; dazzling and intense light may be thrown upon the pupil of the eye; yet so profound is the lethargy, that the sleeper will remain undisturbed and insensible to tortures, which in the waking state would be intolerable.

In the fourth stage, which is that of sonambulism, the patient recovers his internal consciousness, while his outward senses are still asleep. And the singular phenomena called by the Germans *Innere Klarheit*, by the French *Clairvoyance*, and by the English *Lucidity*, is now developed. In the words of Dr. Pritchard†

“The somnambulist can now distinguish by means of the eyes strong

* Introduction, p. 35.

† Treatise on Insanity, p. 425.

light from darkness ; and according to Treviranus, when the eyelids are open, which seldom happens, the pupils are either turned up, as if spasmodically, or are dilated and insensible, all power of moving them being suspended. At the same time the sense of feeling becomes metamorphosed into something equivalent to perfect sight, so that the individual perceives by means of it the finest of those modifications, which are generally only perceptible to the visual sense. She recognizes (for the subjects of these observations are generally females) not only the circumferences and surfaces, but also the colours of objects. She can distinguish the position of the hands of a watch held before her, and by merely touching or sometimes without coming into contact with it. She can read writing and write without any aid from her eyes. The epigastrium is the chief seat or medium of this new species of vision, and somnambulists distinguish the hour on a watch held close to the region of the stomach, and as Gmelin positively declares, know the cards of a pack from each other when they are so placed, without any possibility of their having been seen by the eyes. A somnambulist, mentioned by Tardy, read a piece of writing in characters strange and unknown to her by pressing it on her stomach, her eyes having been securely closed. At first, according to these writers, a strong effort is required on the part of the percipient to exercise this new species of vision with accuracy, but by degrees and long practice it acquires greater perfection. At length, according to the grave and serious declaration of a host of magnetisers, the patient is enabled to perceive through opaque media, and not only without actual contact but at considerable distances, and in a most unaccountable way. A young lady, mentioned in Wienholt's *Miszellen*, was able to read a letter which was at the time folded up and lodged in the pocket of Count Von Lützelburg. Mouilleseaux brought a somnambulist into magnetic relation with a stranger, who had his hand in his pocket, and asked her of what colour was an object which he held. She replied, after some effort, that it was red. That is true, but what is it ? After a stronger exertion she said it is a small pocket-book of red morocco. The answer was correct, and none of the reporters seem to have suspected that the reply was the result of any thing else than some extraordinary perception. A damsel, whose case is given in the *Strasburg Zeitung*, was able to read, not only letters folded up and placed within a cover over her stomach, but a book in another chamber, on a leaf of which a man had placed his open hand, while with the other he held the hand of a third person, the latter holding in like manner a fourth, and a chain being thus formed, as in electrical experiments, the last holding his open hand upon the stomach of the somnambulist."

In a still higher degree of intensity objects become perceptible which cannot be seen by ordinary eyes ; and the reality of which it may therefore be suggested cannot be susceptible of proof. Fischer and Tardy both state that their patients, during the process of magnetising, saw halos of light surrounding themselves and the operators, rays issuing from their fingers, and the breath of the magnetiser proceeding out of the mouth like flames of fire.

But however important such a phenomenon, if real, would be in proving the existence of the magnetic fluid, the natural tendency to spectral illusions in nervous disorders must always appear the most easy mode of solving the problem, until other facts are brought to corroborate the mere vision of the somnambulist.

"The sense of hearing," continues Dr. Pritchard, "also undergoes strange modifications. Pételin discovered accidentally that a young woman, whose ears were insensible to noises, heard plainly and replied to questions uttered close to the epigastrium. A suspicion occurs that the sound reached the ears of the patient. This was obviated by Petzold, who spoke to his somnambulist with so slight a whisper, close to the pit of her stomach, that it was impossible for her ears to be affected. In general magnetised persons are insensible of loud sounds, and hear nothing when addressed by persons who are not in magnetic connection with them, though they reply readily when the operator speaks to them, or when accosted by a third person with whom the magnetiser brings them into relation. *This I have myself observed, when I had an opportunity of witnessing the performance of a celebrated magnetiser in Paris; and I must confess that, however obvious the suspicion, there was every appearance of good faith and sincerity in the parties, and not the slightest indication of collusion.*"

It is to be observed, that in the generality of instances this faculty of clairvoyance develops itself in local organs, and only acts when the object is applied to them, as to the epigastrium, the occiput, the forehead, or the tips of the fingers. In the case of a cataleptic patient of Pételin, cards were successively slipped under the bed-clothes and laid upon the stomach, a watch was held in the closed hand of the operator, an old medal concealed in the hand of a spectator, and all were distinguished. Many other instances are collected in the Baron du Potet's Introduction.

In the fifth and sixth stages of the magnetic state the faculty of clairvoyance continues, but with the addition of new phenomena. The attention of the somnambulist is now directed to his internal organization. And patients are enabled to view the interior of their own bodies, and to describe all the parts of them with the same accuracy as an anatomist. It is by this means that they are supposed to be able to distinguish the cause of their disorders, and to indicate the proper remedies. And this is held out as one of the most immediate and practical advantages to be expected from animal magnetism. This faculty of *clairvoyance* happily extends to the bodies of others as well as of themselves. Fischer relates many anecdotes of extraordinary sympathies between parties placed in magnetic relation to each other. Pepper and salt are placed in one mouth and tasted in another. If the magnetiser is deaf

the patient loses his hearing, and a perfect transfusion of existence takes place so as to produce almost identity of life and consciousness. Undoubtedly these statements will appear very strange and absurd, to all those who ridicule without examination every thing preternatural, and believe every thing to be preternatural which does not fall at once within their own little experience. We have no wish to decide upon the subject; and still less to mix up the phenomena themselves with the question as to their causes. They may be wholly beyond the reach of human influence, and all the exhibitions which have been given may be imposture or delusion in some party or another. But it may perhaps not be useless to throw together a few observations, which may render the facts less incredible, and dispose some minds to examine them with more impartiality, and so to separate the truth from the falsehood.

In the first place, then, if, in discussing a question relating to the human mind, such solemn thoughts may be alluded to without irreverence and safety, a Christian, instead of regarding these phenomena as wholly contradictory to experience and nature, will recognize in them only an exact parallel of facts which make great articles in his religious creed, and form the very support and comfort of his daily life. That his soul can and will exist, independent of his mere animal frame,—that even in this life it may be so far withdrawn from his body as to be in a great degree insensible alike to its temptations and its pains—that in this spiritualized state of existence all its powers and virtues will be, and are, enlarged beyond all human conception—that knowledge is then conveyed to it, of things far beyond sight, by means wholly incomprehensible; that all this is effected by mysterious communications of one Mighty, Connecting, All-Pervading, Unific Spirit, sent into it by the will of the Almighty mind—these great and awful mysteries, inexplicable as they are, are yet the creed and the experience of every Catholic Christian. We have them daily before our eyes. They are supported by the testimony of ages. They form, in fact, the very substance of Christianity. And if men venture with sneers and sarcasm coolly to set aside phenomena so perfectly analogous in the natural world, as wholly incredible and ridiculous, they must be prepared, either to give up their own religious faith upon the same grounds, or to prove at least, what it will not be easy to prove, that there can be no analogy between the constitution and laws and operations of the natural mind of man and those of the spiritualized soul.

The first view, therefore, which a Christian is bound to take of this new doctrine of Magnetism, is, that it represents a metaphysical theory, and intellectual facts, precisely the counterpart

of his own religious belief on the condition and prospects of his own regenerated spirit: and in this very point of view it is extremely remarkable. If Magnetism is true, then there is nothing contrary to reason or experience—nothing which can in the slightest degree be objected to as enthusiasm and delusion, in the highest, and, as they are somewhere termed, the most wild and fanatical doctrines of the Catholic Church. If Magnetism is false, at least all those who have supported it have shown that there is something in its professions congenial to the human mind, not wholly irreconcilable with our reason, not foreign to our wants and desires. True or false, indeed, we must protest against employing it, except in a cursory remark, as an evidence of Christianity, where no evidence is wanted. But, regarded in this light, we may learn better to look on it with perfect quietness and almost indifference, just as a man, who lives on the shores of the Atlantic, listens to tales of waves and tempests on the banks of the Serpentine River.

Many other considerations may then be brought in to support this presumption of an analogy between the spiritual life of a Christian, and the metaphysical history of the natural man. It is borne out in a great measure by fact; and many, if not all the principal phenomena of Magnetism, differ only in degree from facts within our daily experience. The separation of mind from sensation, especially from bodily sensation, is part of the very alphabet of all sound metaphysics. Every one knows what a beautiful use has been made of it in the *Phædo* of Plato* as an argument for the immortality of the soul.

“Is death,” says that great philosopher, “anything but a separation of soul from body? And to be dead, is to leave the body and gather up our soul into itself, where none of our animal senses may intrude to disturb it, neither sight nor hearing, nor pain nor pleasure, but the soul in freedom and independence may enjoy the contemplation of truth. And, so long as we are embarrassed with our body, and our soul is mixed up (*ἐνμπεφυρμένη*) and buried in it, man can never attain his perfection. So that, even in this life, we must extricate and purify ourselves from it, and prepare ourselves for a final release by dying daily.”

And although it is very easy to treat such language as enthusiasm, ethical views are not the less true for passing the comprehension of the vulgar; and they are always the best preparation for metaphysical and physical inquiries. Physics and metaphysics are both beset with an atmosphere not the most healthy, and it is never safe to descend into them without a safety lamp in our hands.

The physical fact of a possible separation between mind and

sensation is very obvious. The separation is sometimes produced by a disorganization of the nervous system. Thus a stunning blow will deaden not merely a local nerve, but the whole animal frame. A division of the nerves of any particular organ instantly shuts out all the sensations conveyed by it. In cases of epilepsy, a disorder which bears a close affinity to magnetic somnambulism, the body becomes often wholly insensible. In catalepsy, apoplexy, syncope, and paralysis, it is the same. And in these disorders, as soon as the body is restored to its proper tone and condition, the mind returns again as it were to take possession of it, without any derangement or diminution of its powers, except such as can be traced to a bodily defect. Sleep is a daily illustration of the fact. If a being of another order were shown, for the first time, a man in full possession of his reason and bodily vigour, and were then told that it was necessary for his health and existence that, during nearly a fourth part of every 24 hours he should continue in a fit of epilepsy and insanity; from which he would recover not only unhurt in reason or mind, but with fresh powers of exertion and enjoyment, he would probably be very much surprised. And yet sleep is only a mitigated form of epilepsy, and dreams a perfect form of temporary insanity, in which, by some change in the nerves, they become incapable of conveying sensation, and the mind is then given up to itself, perhaps to remain, in some cases, wholly torpid and inactive, but for the most part to be passively subjected to the irritation of the internal nerves of the stomach acting upon the strange and tangled combinations of old associations, without any check upon the wanderings of fancy, such as in our waking moments is imposed on it by certain fixed objects of sense constantly present, and recalling us to unity of thought and purpose. We do not know, indeed, what is the precise change or disorder which thus destroys or suspends the irritability of the organs of sensation. But that it is suspended we do know: and our ignorance is a sufficient reason for not pronouncing rashly as to the possibility of producing the same effect by means unperceived hitherto.

There is still, however, another mode of deadening the sensibilities of the body; and that is by a morbid or increased activity of the mind, without any derangement whatever in the bodily organs. And this distinction, which physiologists have sometimes overlooked, ought to be borne in mind when we are attempting to explain certain phenomena of magnetism.

Thus, in battle, there are well known instances of persons who have even been deprived of whole limbs, yet remained unconscious of it, until they fainted from loss of blood. Violent pas-

sions, such as anger, fear, or grief, not only produce physical syncope and epilepsy, but render men insensible to objects however close and striking, which have no connection with the immediate affection. Absence of mind, which may almost be called a waking somnambulism, is another instance. The thoughts are occupied by one absorbing train of reflection. The senses are open, and convey partial sensations. We do not indeed, in England, often hear of the extreme cases which are said to occur in America, where a man puts himself into the post-office instead of his letter, or, in undressing at night, throws over the back of his chair himself instead of his coat, and is found frozen to death the next morning. But this partial insensibility, brought on by absorption of thought, is very common even with us. Dr. Glover, the author of the celebrated ballad of "Admiral Hosier's Ghost," rose up in the middle of the night to compose it, walked into the flower garden at Stowe, where he was staying, and, in the fervour of composition, hewed down a whole bed of magnificent tulips, without knowing, the next morning, that he had touched a flower. Mr. Harvest, a well-known scholar and clergyman, would dismount from his horse and lead it, as he thought, by the bridle, never discovering, while the bridle was in his hand, that the horse had slipped from it. He would read a Greek book in a punt upon the Thames and, in an ecstasy of delight, throw himself backward into the water. He would see his congregation going to church on a prayer day, and walk in with his fishing-rod in his hand to ask what was going on. Sir Isaac Newton was sitting one night, absorbed in thought, before an enormous fire, which nearly roasted him; he rang the bell with great violence, and in an unusual irritation called out to the servant, "Why do not you take away the grate, you rascal, I shall be burnt to death?" "Pray, master," said the servant, "would it not be easier to draw away your chair?" "Oh," said Sir Isaac, "I never thought of that."

In these and similar cases, it is observable that there is no destruction of sensibility in the local organs. Dr. Glover at the time felt that he was slashing something, though his attention was not turned to it, and therefore the fact was not retained in his memory. Mr. Harvest felt the bridle. Sir Isaac Newton was suffering from heat. But there appears to be a sort of partial paralysis or stoppage of some interior faculty or organ, which, when the mind is quite alive, combines several impressions from sense into one correct judgment.

In natural somnambulism, a similar effect seems to take place, but from a different cause. The somnambulist, as in the case of

Devaud,* can smell, taste, feel, and see. He can carry on conversation, write, and correct, distinguish his own clothes from those of others. He heard a clock strike which repeated the note of a cuckoo, and immediately said that there were cuckoos in the room. So in the cases recorded by Dr. Abercrombie,† the patient was

“taken to church while under the attack, and there behaved with propriety, evidently attending to the preacher, and she was at one time so much affected as to shed tears.” “She was also capable of following her usual employments during the paroxysm. At one time she laid out the table correctly for breakfast, and repeatedly dressed herself and the children of the family.” “In another instance, the somnambulist began by degrees to observe those who were in the apartment, and she could tell correctly their number. She now also became capable of answering questions that were put to her, and with regard to both she showed astonishing acuteness.”

So in the well known cases of sleep-walkers who have climbed roofs, saddled horses, or walked out of windows. There is every where a certain degree of consciousness of particular objects, such as particularly fix the attention, but the others are lost as it were, or perhaps, to speak more accurately, they are not observed; and the consequence is, that judgments, but false judgments, are deduced.

Thus, in the case of Negratti,* as given by the physician

* See the Report of the Committee on his case to the Physical Society of Lausanne.

† Intellectual Powers, 4th edit. p. 294.

‡ Negratti was a servant of the Marquis Luigi Sale. And the facts of his case have been published by two physicians, Righellini and Pigatti, who had both witnessed it. On the evening of the 16th March, 1740 (we borrow the account from Dr. Pritchard), after going to sleep on a bench in the kitchen, he began first to talk, then walked about, went to the dining room, and spread a table for dinner, placed himself behind a chair with a plate in his hand, as if waiting on his master. After waiting until he thought his master had dined, he uncovered the table, put away all the materials in a basket, which he locked in a cupboard. He afterwards warmed a bed, locked up the house, and prepared for his nightly rest. Being then awakened, and asked if he remembered what he had been doing he answered no. This however was not always the case, as recollection in some instances took place. He would awake if water was thrown on his face, or his eyes were forced open, and then he remained for some time faint and stupid. During the paroxysm his eyes were closed, and he took no notice, even if a candle were placed closed to them. Sometimes he struck himself against the wall, and hurt himself severely. If any body pushed him he got out of the way, and moved his arms rapidly about on every side. In a strange place he felt about with his hands, and was very inaccurate in all his proceedings. Where he was familiar with the situation, he went through his business very cleverly. Pigatti shut a door through which he had just passed, he struck himself against it on returning. Sometimes he carried a candle about as if to light him, but when a bottle was substituted he did not perceive the difference. Once he said in his sleep that he must go and hold a torch behind his master. It was observed, that although the torch was not lighted, he stood with it at the corner of the street. One night he went into the kitchen and sat down to eat, and then, as if recollecting himself, exclaimed, “How can I so forget? to day is Friday and I must not dine.” On another occasion, he asked

Pigatti, the somnambulist sits down to eat, as he thinks, a salad, without perceiving that cabbage has been substituted for it. He asks for wine, but drinks water, demands snuff, and receives ground coffee, without being aware of the difference.

“Other sleep-walkers,” observes Dr. Pritchard with his usual judgment, “are well known to have detected similar deceptions. The difference appears to be in the degree of attention; a more lively perception, as to the qualities of the object desired, existed in one case than in the other, the mind being more directed to particular sensations in the one case, and more distracted or diverted from them in the other.”

Perhaps the phenomenon may be understood better by considering the process of reasoning in ordinary matters of sense. If Sir Isaac Newton, for instance, had not been absorbed in thought, there would have been a natural activity and restlessness of the senses, especially of the eyes, which would have brought into his groups of ideas the immovability of the grate, and the facility of moving his chair, which, coupled with the sensation of extreme heat, would at once have suggested the appropriate remedy.

If Dr. Glover, instead of thinking exclusively on his ballad, had turned with a disengaged eye to the flower-garden round him, he would necessarily have remembered that he was at Stowe, that tulips were favourite flowers, that the destruction of them was very objectionable. If Mr. Harvest had glanced from his book to the side of his punt, he would not have forgotten that a deep river was ready to receive him if he overbalanced himself. And he would not have suffered his horse to be slipped from the bridle, if he had inferred the horse's presence from some other sense beside that of the touch of the bridle.

In fact, all true conclusions are the result of many associations and suggestions, brought together from a variety of quarters and by the natural activity of several senses. And if, either from disease or absorption of mind, this activity is deadened, we err with the same unconsciousness of error as the man who walks into a room full of company, satisfied that he is properly drest, when without his knowledge the tails of his coat have been cut off, or orders an expensive dinner at a strange inn, not knowing that his pocket has been picked of his purse, or rises in the middle of the night, because his watch stands at six in the

the cook for cakes and salad, and ate them. He went into the cellar, drew wine, and drank it; he also carried a tray on which were wine-glasses and knives, and turned it obliquely on passing through a narrow door-way to avoid an accident. This last fact is remarkable, as exhibiting, as it were, an extemporaneous instinct for the occasion, similar to what is sometimes found in animals on the occurrence of unforeseen emergencies, and which is the nearest approach of mere habit and instinct to reason.

morning, without inquiring if the stars will tell the same story of the hour. It is well known that apparently the simplest and easiest of our senses, the sight, is in reality the result of a long concatenation of observations and reasonings, assisted both by the touch and the hearing. Cut off these senses, and our vision would remain for ever full of incorrectness. "What a magnificent range of mountains," said a friend in a strange country, at the sight of a low ridge of hills veiled in a faint mist, like the haze of distance. "Suppose," said another, who was standing by the Lake of Geneva, "we row over, after dinuer, to the opposite shore, and return in an hour's time to tea." "Sir," said the boatman, "are you aware that the lake is eleven miles across?" In each case colour was assumed as the one criterion of distance, and in each, from the want of experience, it was defective. There is, in fact, in the telescope of the mind, not merely glasses to reflect objects, but a pivot on which it turns, and so takes in a succession of objects, to form from them one landscape. There is a spring by which we shift our ideas, as we shift the barrels of a musical box. There is a power of passing the fingers over a variety of keys, instead of their being fixed to harp upon one alone. In some cases this spring is preternaturally active. It moves so rapidly, that there is no time to observe, collect, arrange, or remember. And this cast of mind, though full of levity and frivolity, is often accompanied with genius, and throws out singular caleidoscope combinations of beauty, from the very restlessness of its motions. In others it seems naturally wanting, as a man may be born with a stiff joint. Under this head comes the wretched class of Cretins and Ideots. In others it is forgotten to be used, as in absence of mind. In others it is more or less easy to move, probably from the comparative irritability of the constitutional system. Sometimes it seems to rust, as it were, and become stiff from want of exercise, as in those who are tied down to monotonous occupations, and thus acquire peculiar idiosyncracies, antipathies, and modes of seeing things. Not uncommonly some bodily obstruction will produce a transient effect of this kind. Nothing is more common in disturbed dreams, than to find stoppages and impediments, as it were, to the flow of ideas—singular embarrassments of which no cause seems to exist, but in which one feeling or situation is impressed upon the mind, seemingly without a possibility of escaping. A soldier finds himself in battle, but unable to draw his sword. A lawyer goes to read his brief, but the sheets are glued together. A scholar tries to read, but the characters of the book are illegible. And in all these cases the obstruction may always be connected with some derangement in the digestive organs. So also in a

NO. XLVIII.—OCT. 1838. Y

state of fever and nervous irritation, a single idea, sometimes a familiar tune, sometimes a peculiar face, will haunt the imagination like a vision, sometimes so distinctly as to take the extreme form of spectral illusion, and at times, though very rarely, that of positive sound. The phenomenon of the two last classes seem, indeed, to be produced by rather different causes. The former class, by some obstruction in those functions of digestion, which are probably the chief agents in raising sensations and ideas during sleep; the latter by an irritable and inflammatory state of the nervous system, such as is produced by intoxication, during which there is the same tendency to dwell upon one idea, and see things in one light. The very rapidity of successive bodily sensations having a tendency to engross the mind with some one idea exclusively—as the rolling rapidly in a carriage destroys the sense of consecutive sensation, and as a party-coloured paper wheeled quickly round takes one colour. And this, not merely the physical effect, seems to explain the use of the circular swing, which has been introduced into lunatic asylums with admirable results, for the purpose of quieting violent patients. A remarkable instance of this unity of idea, in the midst of violent excitement, is given by Chiaruggi; it was a woman in a state of frightful insanity, who had sat during twenty-five years on a stone-floor, unceasingly beating the ground with her chains day and night.

This will bring us to the most violent form of the disorder, which occurs in fixed monomania. The occupation of the mind by one paramount idea, is indeed a common feature in all insanity, except raving madness. But there are evidently two kinds of this disease, which probably may be traced to the two distinct causes just suggested. In the one kind, most commonly known by the name, there is no unsoundness of mind except on one point. There is indeed an absurd and delusive notion prevailing, but all the deductions from it are perfectly sound and rational. There is a well-known account in Donatus,* of a man named Vincentinus, who believed that he was so corpulent as to be unable to pass through the door of his room. He was ordered to be forcibly led through; and this was done, but as they forced him along, Vincentinus shrieked out that the flesh was torn from his bones, and his limbs broken off, and he died in a few days under the delusion.

Another monomaniac, a patient of Dr. Steventon, of Baltimore, after a variety of strange fancies, believed himself dead. Dr. Steventon was sent to him one morning in great haste, and found

* Hist. Med.

him in bed stretched out at full length, his toes in contact, his eyes and mouth close shut, and his looks cadaverous. "Well, Sir, how do you do this morning?" asked Dr. Steventon in a jocular way, approaching his bed. "How do I do," replied the hypochondriac faintly; "a pretty question to ask a dead man." "Dead!" replied the doctor. "Yes, Sir, dead, quite dead. I died last night about twelve o'clock." Dr. Steventon put his hand to the patient's forehead, as if to ascertain if it was cold, and also feeling his pulse, exclaimed in a doleful voice, "Yes! the poor man is dead enough; 'tis all over with him; and now, the sooner he is buried the better." A coffin was procured, the procession arranged, and the family were ordered to exhibit all the usual signs of distress. And as the coffin was brought into the church-yard, it was concerted that several of the neighbours should come up, and enter into conversation with the bearers. "Whom have you there?" said one. "Poor Mr. B." was the answer; "he died last night." "Pity he had not died long ago," said the inquirer; "he was a bad man." "Whose funeral is this?" asked another. "Poor Mr. B. is dead," said the doctor. "Ah! indeed. And so he is gone at last. And a very good thing too." One or two similar remarks at last fairly put the deceased out of patience, until throwing off the coffin lids, he jumped up to chastise the libellers, and after chasing them through the church-yard, was carried home perfectly convinced of his own existence, and never afterwards was troubled with any similar delusion.

Another,* a lieutenant in the navy, appeared in 1817 before the lord mayor, complaining that the people in the house where he lodged had conspired to destroy him by means of electricity; that they had actually deprived him of his ankle bones, and the knobs of his wrists, and had superinduced a consumption; that they had bled him, applied leeches; and, at last, that the young lady, by means of the power of attraction, had succeeded in drawing two of his teeth, which he produced in court as a proof of the assertion.

A third case, given by Dr. Jacobi, and extracted by Dr. Pritchard, is worth adding. It was a man in other respects of rational, quiet, discreet habits, so that he was employed in the domestic business of the asylum; and yet he laboured under the impression that there was a person concealed in his stomach, with whom he held frequent conversations. He often perceived the absurdity of this idea, and grieved in acknowledging and reflecting that he was under the influence of so groundless a persuasion,

* A very similar case was brought before the lord mayor within the last few weeks.

but could never get rid of it. It was very curious to observe, says Jacobi, how, when he had but an instant before cried, "What nonsense! Is it not intolerable to be so deluded?" and while the tears which accompanied these exclamations were yet in his eyes, he again began to talk, apparently with entire conviction, about the whispering of the person in his stomach, who told him that he was to marry a great princess.* An attempt was made to cure this man by putting a large blister on his stomach, and at the instant when it was drest, and the vesicated skin snipped, throwing from behind him a dressed up figure, as if just extracted from his body. The experiment so far succeeded, that the patient believed in the performance, and his joy was at first boundless in the full persuasion that he was cured. But some morbid feeling about the bowels, which he had associated with the insane impression, still continuing, or being again experienced, he took up the idea that another person similar to the first, was still left within him, and under that persuasion he still continued to labour.†

We have thrown together these illustrations, which happen to be lying within our reach, for the purpose of showing that there is nothing incredible in three of the phenomena exhibited during the fits of epilepsy, which are said to be superinduced during the process of magnetising;—first, the insensibility of the body; secondly, the abstraction of attention from surrounding objects; thirdly, the partial consciousness of present circumstances, particularly of those which are connected with the predominant subject of thought.

There are one or two instances on record of a still more remarkable abstraction of sense: Jerome Cardan, whose life by his own account abounded in a variety of singular phenomena, speaks of himself, if we recollect rightly, as possessing at one time the power of dying and returning to life.

Augustin mentions another case, which may be given in his own words—

"Jam illud multo est incredibilius, quod plerique fratres memoriæ recentissimæ experti sunt, Presbyter fuit quidam nomine Restitutus à paræciâ Calamensis Ecclesiæ, qui quando ei placebat (rogabatur autem, ut hoc faceret ab eis qui rem mirabilem coram scire cupiebant) ad imitatus quasi lamentantis cujuslibet hominis voces, ita se auferebat a sensibus et jacebat simillimus mortuo, ut non solum vellicantes atque pungentes minime sentiret, sed aliquando etiam igne ureretur admoto, sine ullo

* This whispering of an internal voice is a very common feature in insanity. It occurs very remarkably in the early history of Quakerism.—See *Turner's History of Providences*, c. 86.

† Dr. Max Jacobi, *Sammlungen für die Heilkunde der Gemuthskrankheiten*.—*Pritchard's Treatise on Insanity*, p. 32.

doloris sensu, nisi postmodum ex vulnere. Non autem obuitendo, sed non sentiendo non movere corpus, eo probabatur, quòd tanquam in defuncto nullus inveniebatur anhelitus: hominum tamen voces si clarius loquerentur, tamquam de longinquo se audire postea referebat."—*De Civit. Dei*, lib. xiv. c. 24.

A similar case, which Tertullian and others recognized as epilepsy, is referred to by Pliny.*

"Reperimus inter exempla, Hermotimi Clazomenii animam relicto corpore errare solitam, vagamque e longinquo multa annunciare, quæ nisi a præsentē nosci non possent, corpore interim semianimi; donec cremato eo inimici (qui Cantharidæ vocabantur) remeanti animæ velut vaginam ademerint."†

The one most fully stated is here given on the authority of Dr. Cheyne.

"Colonel Townshend, a gentleman of honor and integrity, had for many years been afflicted with a nephritic complaint. His illness increasing, and his strength decaying, he came from Bristol to Bath in a litter in autumn and lay at the Bell Inn. Dr. Baynard and I (Dr. Cheyne) were called to him, and attended him twice a day; but his vomitings continuing still incessant and obstinate against all remedies, we despaired of his recovery. While he was in this condition, he sent for us one morning: we waited on him with Mr. Skrine his apothecary. We found his senses clear, and his mind calm: his nurse and several servants were about him. He told us he had sent for us to give him some account of an odd sensation he had for some time observed and felt in himself; which was, that, composing himself, he could die or expire when he pleased, and yet by an effort, or some how, he could come to life again: which he had sometimes tried before he sent for us. We heard this with surprise; but as it was not to be accounted for from common principles, we could hardly believe the fact as he related it, much less give any account of it: unless he should please to make the experiment before us, which we were unwilling he should do, lest in his weak condition he might carry it too far. He continued to talk very distinctly and sensibly above a quarter of an hour, about this surprising sensation, and insisted so much on our seeing the trial made, that we were at last forced to comply. We all three felt his pulse first; it was distinct, though small and thready; and his heart had its usual beating. He composed himself on his back, and lay in a still posture some time; while I held his right hand, Dr. Baynard laid his hand on his heart, and Mr. Skrine held a clean looking glass to his mouth. I found his pulse sink gradually, till at last I could not feel any, by the most exact and nice touch. Dr. Baynard could not feel the least motion in his heart, nor Mr. Skrine the least soil of breath on the bright mirror he held to his mouth; then each of us by turns examined his arm, heart, and

* Nat. Hist. lib. ii. c. 53.

† See also M. Casanton's *Treatise of Enthusiasm*, ch. 3, and Bodinus *Dæmon.* lib. ii. c. 5.

breath, but could not by the nicest scrutiny discover the least symptom of life in him. We reasoned a long time about this odd appearance as well as we could, and all of us judging it inexplicable and unaccountable, and finding he still continued in that condition, we began to conclude that he had indeed carried the experiment too far, and at last were satisfied he was actually dead, and were just ready to leave him. This continued above half an hour. As we were going away, we observed some motion about the body, and upon examination, found his pulse and the motion of his heart gradually returning: he began to breathe gently, and speak softly: we were all astonished to the last degree at this unexpected change, and, after some further conversation with him among ourselves, went away fully satisfied as to all the particulars of this fact, but confounded and puzzled, and not able to form any rational scheme that might account for it."—*Percy Anecdotes*, vol. ii. p. 68.

To return, however, to the subject of magnetism. Another phenomenon still more remarkable is the state of the mind during this temporary withdrawal from sensation.

To comprehend this effect, we ought to understand, far better than we do, the nature of the connection between sense and mind, and the offices which the external world fulfils in relation to the internal, moral, and intellectual faculties. If these were once clearly distinguished, there would be no difficulty in anticipating the results, when the relation was temporarily suspended, as it evidently may be for a time. When the subject of Dr. Chalmers' Bridgewater Treatise was announced, it was hoped that much light would be thrown on this very interesting problem. But unhappily the rather forced and farfetched construction put upon the question by the excellent person to whom it was proposed, has left the whole subject untouched.

There appear then to be four *principal* functions, which the external world of sense discharges with respect to that spirit of man which is inclosed within it, as an embryo in a womb, or a kernel in its shell.

First, it puts the faculties in movement, supplies materials of ideas, which the mind then arranges, digests and analyses, as corn is put into a mill. All the wheels of the machine and the laws by which they move exist wholly independently of the wheat which they grind, but perhaps cannot begin to move until something is given them to work upon.

Secondly, when these operations are once commenced, the senses serve to occupy and amuse the mind, when it is incapable (as it is incapable, except for short intermitting periods) of laborious thought and exertion. The greatest part even of our waking life is necessary to be spent as it were in a theatre, where sight and sound, and taste and smell, may be presented to it without effort of its own, in gay and varied succession; and the sensibili-

ties may be stimulated just so far as to prevent torpor or restlessness, but no farther. In this point of view the vast fabric of nature, with its panoramas of heaven and earth, its endless dioramic changes of morning and evening and night, its microscopic wonders, the shifting of the clouds, with all the alternations of seasons and foliage, and lights and colour, the movements of air and water and animated life, flitting before us and grouping themselves in endless combinations, like actors and processions on a stage, its concerts in woods and field—every thing that nature, or rather God, has provided to please the eye and the ear, are as innocent toys and recreations for us his helpless children, when we are wearied with work, and yet cannot sleep. When applied to their proper purpose, they are not amusements for the idle, who very soon cease to relish them, but relaxations for the laborious, who are placed here to work and toil, but from the infirmity of their frame cannot toil long at a time.

A third very important use of the external world is to assist and regulate the intellect. This point was touched on before, and it is of great importance in accounting for the intellectual phenomena which occur in states of catalepsy, and other similar disorders. Every one knows the nature of a day dream; when a man throws himself back in his chair, gives way to the current of his ideas, without attempting to control them, follows them wherever they lead, and almost loses sight of the place where he is, and the circumstances around him. Every one knows also that, in this maze of recalled associations, the strangest contradictions and impossibilities groupe themselves together; persons are recalled to life; distant countries visited and traversed in a moment; positions imagined for ourselves, which are wholly beyond our reach. What Pinel says of the realities of a mad house is true of these indolent reveries.* “In one chair is a general, who fights an important battle, and leaves fifty thousand men dead on the field. In another is a monarch, who talks of nothing but his subjects and provinces. In another is the prophet Mahomet in person, who denounces vengeance in the name of the Almighty. Close by him is a sovereign of the universe, who can with a breath annihilate the world.” A man of taste, on the other hand, takes the line of the maniac who muttered to M. Calmeil. “Being the most puissant of emperors I shall build a new Paris in four hours: the streets shall be paved with gold; they shall meet in a great square, which shall occupy the midst; they shall have on each side two rows of galleries like a bazaar. Every where there shall be a display of bronze statues and marble columns. The beds in the apartment

* Pinel on Insanity, p. 157.

shall be made of rosewood. In the place of curtains there shall be mirrors, which shall be fixed at the four corners by hinges of diamonds."

Still more frequently indolent persons abandon themselves to the phantasies of the moment without any leading idea to regulate them, and their visions and words, if transferred to paper, would exhibit a specimen of existence full as wild as the wildest ravings of a lunatic, or the wanderings of intoxication. Now this is the natural state and tendency of all minds, until we have acquired the power of regulating our thoughts. One train of strangely linked ideas is poured into them by past associations. Another series is constantly suggested by external impressions; partly arising from the outward senses, and partly from that portion of the epigastrium which seems to form one of the centres of the nervous system. And these are all so mixed together, that all order and sequence is lost, and the result is a temporary delirium. The mode of reducing them to order is by keeping steadily before us some one idea, and rejecting and repelling all those which cannot be brought into harmony or connection with it. The mind of a reasoning being is like the root of a tree, stretching out its fibres to collect and assimilate every particle of nutriment, which it can bring into affinity with its own substance. Or it resembles a polypus, lying quiet, with its fringe of tentacula spread out, with the one ruling thought of food to regulate its seizure of animalcula that float by. It has in fact no power but of rejection, and no law of rejection but accordance or discordance with some one principle or idea which it holds steadily before it. Now it is very true, that under some strong exciting passion, or in men of great power of abstract attention, this idea may be grasped firmly without the aid of the senses, as when men close their eyes to prevent distraction, or retire, as Sarti the composer used to do, to a dark room, and Passiello to bed. But for the most part it is necessary to have some fixed object with which the leading idea is associated kept constantly present to the eye, or to some other sense. Thus, when we are writing we look up in one corner of the room, and, what is said in jest, really takes place, that the ideas connected with the subject do gather themselves round that point, and notwithstanding perpetual digressions, every time we return there, we find them conglomerated and ready for use, and continue to swell their number by bringing back each assimilated thought which occurs in our various excursions. Close up the senses, especially the eyes, and let there be no prominent idea in the mind, or faculty of fixing the attention, and a temporary insanity, as in sleep, at once takes place.

This point may be reverted to again. At present one other use of the organs of sensation may be suggested, which will sound to many very mystical and superstitious, but which is supported by very high philosophical authorities, and is perfectly in harmony with the Scriptural hints respecting the human mind. They serve probably as much to confine our knowledge as to extend it. They may be friendly checks upon the activity of its faculties and the range of its perceptions, just as stilts, which are instruments of walking, are very great impediments to movement, and glasses, where the eyes are sound, only dim and confound the sight. In this point of view our ears may be given us to prevent our hearing, our eyes to blind our sight, our feet to embarrass locomotion, or rather the whole process by which mind is incarcerated, as it were, in matter, may have this necessary result, and the organs of sense may be provided to give only such facilities of perception as are absolutely essential to existence, and no more. There is evidently a world of beings and things around us of which we know nothing, but from faith. And whether we turn to Scripture or the phenomena which are sometimes exhibited even in the natural world, as in the hour of death, in trances, and other singular and critical states of the human mind, we cannot but believe that this world is opened to us at times, though in a manner wholly unlike the action of our physical organs. Man is always described in the Bible as lying in a state of darkness: it speaks constantly of his eyes being opened by a supernatural power. The more general mode in which the revelation of a syiritual world is made to him, is by throwing him into a deep sleep; sometimes, as in the case of Balaam, "with his eyes open." And those who attentively look to the instances in which the presence of a spiritual power is described in the Scriptures, both Old and New, will find it almost always accompanied with a state of sleep in the human beings present.

It is neither right nor safe to press Scriptural facts, which are more or less connected with the supernatural dispensations of God, into the illustration of natural phenomena beyond a certain point. And we have no intention of doing this. But they may be remembered when it is stated, that in the epilepsy of Magnetism, when sleep is produced, and the mind is withdrawn, as it were, from the influence of sensation, it becomes in some instances possessed of new powers, and seems to take a wider range of consciousness. That this does not take place except in comparatively few instances, even the most sanguine magnetisers allow. And probably even these instances may be reduced to general laws already recognized. The case of natural somnambulism described by Dr. Abercrombie, where a servant girl in her

paroxysm talked Latin and Hebrew, was cleared up by the discovery that she had many years before lived with a master who had been in the habit of speaking these languages in her hearing. And though her attention had not been directed to them at the time, they had remained dormant, as it were, in the memory, and woke up during the fit, as letters written in invisible ink re-appear when they are held to the fire. The same thing occurred to a friend in his sleep, who was studying Italian. When awoke he could not put two words together, but in his dreams he talked the language with the greatest fluency. The words recurring as they do in common speaking and in writing by a natural flow, and not being recalled by an effort of thought. So also the cases of supposed sorcery in France, where Latin was often spoken by the patients, may be explained by their recollection of phrases heard during the service of mass. And the few fragments, very few, indeed, of intelligible tongues, or any tongues whatever, which could be picked out from the jargon of the unhappy Irvingites, may also easily be traced to similar accidental recurrences. However this may be, we only wish in this phenomenon as in the others, that due regard should be paid to the analogy of facts; and that the representations of Magnetism, whether realized or not, should not be thrown aside with contempt as absurd and incredible, when they are supported by adequate testimony, and have any parallel, or seeming parallel, in the acknowledged order of nature. Candour and impartiality, and, above all, a consciousness that we know very little of the wonders of the spiritual world, are the temper with which they must be examined by all who would profess themselves philosophers, and especially by those who would approach them in the spirit of a Christian philosopher. To return however to the immediate question. Here are four modes in which the external world of sense acts upon the intellect, and by acting on the intellect very materially influences and controls the moral tendencies of man. And when the connection is broken, and the mind is left to itself, it is now easy to trace the consequences.

In the first place, though we must not do more than advert to this point, which does not affect the present subject, mind never acted upon at all by sense, would probably never be called into movement. It might remain with all its springs and wheels, and laws of movement, which constitute the treasure which it brings into the world, to use the philosophical word, with all its innate ideas, perfect and ready to move, but dormant till the sense roused it, as the steam-engine exists in quiescence till the fire begins to warm the water. This is the true solution of the rival doctrines of sensualism and idealism.

Secondly, when sensation, after having been exerted, was again withdrawn, the mind would fall back upon its own resources, upon past associations, or internal springs of thought and fancy. If these failed, it would become weary and restless, subject to that melancholy state of vacuity and irritability, which the French happily express by *ennui*; but which very often assumes a much more fearful form than fashionable vapours, and becomes a species of positive insanity. If there is any tendency to repose, sleep will be superinduced with more or less profoundness.

Thirdly, if this sleep does not terminate in perfect torpor, the mind will exhibit all its movements, impulses and ideas, removed from that control, which, in a waking and natural state, reduces them to order, conceals those which are repulsive, and checks their extravagances.

It will then take the form of insanity, either fixed or temporary, as in dreams and waking reveries. If some particular idea has seized possession of the mind, this will shape and modify the general current of thought, and though the idea itself may be illusion, others will group and form themselves around it, very often without the slightest departure from the analogy of reason. If, on the other hand, the unsound state is caused by an irritation of the nervous system, as by humours in the blood, inflammation of the intestinal canal, oppression or lesion of the brain, or even, as in some cases, by a simple wound, mania will probably ensue with more or less violence, continuing or intermitting with the alternations of the constitutional disorder. And all this will arise from the removal of that check, which, in a sound state of mind, is constantly maintained over even its momentary movements, feelings, and impulses.

Thus it is that apparently the same cause will produce the most opposite effects, according to character, previous habits, and constitutional tendency. So it is in insanity; so it is in intoxication; so it is in that peculiar kind of intoxication produced by inhaling what is called the laughing gas. And so also in the case of somnambulism, it is not easy to say what turn the movement will take when released from its usual control.

“Sometimes,” says the Baron du Potet,* speaking of the effect of the treatment adopted by Mesmer, “a certain exaltation of the mind, and a lively sense of comfort was experienced; then followed convulsions, which sometimes were of remarkable violence and duration. To these physiological were often added very extraordinary moral phenomena; some of the patients burst into immoderate fits of laughter, others melted into tears; they often appeared mutually attracted by irresistible im-

* *Animal Magnetism*, p. 141.

pulses of sympathy, and seemed to entertain the most lively affection for each other. But the most surprising circumstance was the prodigious influence which the magnetiser exercised over his patients. The least sign of his will excited or calmed the convulsions, commanded love or hatred. He then stood before them, like a magician with his wand, under the waving of which their souls and bodies were kept in submissive obedience. Such were the results of the magnetic operations as conducted by Mesmer, which the ancient commissioners verified, and minutely described in their reports."*

* In the words of the commissioners,—“ Some remained calm and tranquil, others coughed, spat, felt some slight pain, a local or universal heat, and had sweat; others were agitated, tormented with convulsions, most extraordinary by their force, their number, and their duration; as soon as one began, another succeeded; the paroxysms lasted sometimes three hours; the patients spat a thick viscous, and sometimes bloody fluid; the attacks were characterized by precipitate, violent, and involuntary movements of the members or the whole body, by constrictions of the throat, by spasms at the epigastrium and hypochondria, piercing cries, tears, hiccough, and immoderate laughter. Nothing could be more astonishing than the sight of these agitations and various seizures; the sympathies which established themselves between all these individuals struck us with amazement. We beheld the patients precipitating themselves one towards the other, smiling and talking to each other with affection, and mutually alleviating their agitations. Every thing depended upon the will of the magnetiser; were they in an apparently deep sleep, his voice, a look, a sign, drew them out of it.” —*Rapport des Commissaires chargés par le Roi de l'examen du Magnétisme Animal.* Paris, 1784.

It may not be amiss to transcribe the account of the apparatus by which these effects were produced. It is scarcely necessary to add that it is now wholly discontinued. “ A little wooden tub of different forms, round, oval or square, raised one foot, or one foot and a half, was placed in the middle of a large room. This tub was called ‘ the baquet;’ its covering was pierced with a certain number of holes, from out of which came branches of iron, jointed and flexible. The patients were placed in several rows round this baquet, and each person held the branch of iron, which, by means of the joints, could be applied to the part affected; a cord was placed round the bodies of the patients, which united them one to another. Sometimes a second chain was formed by communication with the hands, that is to say, by applying the thumb of one between the thumb and first finger of the next person; the thumb thus held was then pressed, and the impression received on the left was returned by the right, and circulated all around. A piano forte was placed in a corner of a room, different airs were played upon it, sometimes the sound of the voice in singing was added.¹ All the magnetisers had in their hand a little rod of iron, ten or twelve inches long. This rod was looked upon as the conductor of magnetism; it possessed the advantage of concentrating it in its point, and of rendering the emanations more powerful. Sound, according to the principles of Mesmer, was also a conductor of magnetism; and, in order to communicate the fluid to the piano, it was sufficient to let the rod approach it. The cord with which the patients were surrounded was destined, as well as the chain of thumbs, to augment the effects by communication. The inside of the baquet was said to be so formed that it might concentrate the magnetic fluid; there was nothing, however, in reality, in its formation which could excite or retain magnetism or electricity.

“ The patients ranged in great numbers, and in several rows round the baquet, received magnetism by all the different ways; by the iron branches which came out of the tub, by the cord which was entangled round their bodies, by the union of the thumbs, by the sound of the piano, and agreeable voices which mingled with it. They were directly magnetised by means of the finger and the iron rod, moved before the

¹ Singing was also a principal instrument in producing the first extravagancies of Methodism.

Now, however magical this may sound, there is nothing in it which is not perfectly reconcileable with known facts, and may not be explained without any recurrence to the magnetic fluid.

Nearly all these patients, it must be remembered, labour previously under a disordered state of the nervous system. They are subject to epilepsy, catalepsy, or some disease of the kind. We all know what convulsions and distortions take place spontaneously when the nerves are at all excited. Hysterics, sobbing, laughing, shrieking, sounds of the most wild and insane character, violent gesticulation, tearing the hair, beating the breast, clasping the hands, fixing the eye-balls, distending the nostrils, throwing every limb into the most forced and unnatural positions, and continuing them motionless,—in short, every species of convulsion is exhibited daily in cases of violent emotion, whether of fear, sorrow, or joy; and perhaps they would be infinitely more common, and take place on the slightest notice, if we had not learned, in the habits of society, and by a manly contempt for mere feeling, to check these extravagancies the moment they begin to appear. We all know also how rapidly they increase and overpower every attempt to suppress them, when they have once been indulged. And the variety and intensity of mental emotion are equally intelligible, when they are compared with the extravagant hopes, the profound sullenness, or the transports of anger, love, or joy, which take place under the influence of intoxication, according to the character or whim of the party.

If, in fact, we must hint our own opinion, it is that magnetism is but another species of inebriation, by whatever agent it is brought on. And if this illustration of the disorder was more plainly employed, it would probably serve as the preventive against its abuse, and at any rate would lead to the withdrawal of such scenes of temporary deliquium, or delirium, from the public eyes, to which, especially in the case of females, from mere delicacy, they ought not to be exposed.

It is not a little worthy of notice that these moral appearances of violent feeling, sympathy and subjection to the control of a leader, are by no means peculiar to Magnetism, but are to be found in every case where numbers of persons are brought together in a state of excitement. The exultations of religious fanaticism in the east, the mysteries of Paganism, the meetings of heretical sects in the Christian Church—Quakerism, Metho-

face, above or behind the head, and upon the diseased parts, always observing the distinction of the poles. They were acted upon by a fixed look, but above all, they were magnetised by the application of hands, and by the pressure of fingers upon the hypochondria, and upon the abdominal region; an application often continued for a long time, sometimes during several hours."

dism, and even popular political movements, all present the same features.

Besides however this insane state of mind, there is a third phenomenon asserted in Animal Magnetism, which deserves a few remarks before we turn to the question, by what means they are all elicited. How are we to account for the lucidity or clairvoyance, which, upon testimony not yet to be got rid of, has been exhibited in advanced stages of the crisis? For testimony there is, to which we must look with very great deference. There may be occasional mistakes, ill-conducted experiments, failures in some instances, even collusion and imposition in others, but it is impossible for any sound-minded man to read the accounts which have been published by the most eminent physicians of Europe, and cast them all aside in contempt, without setting at defiance every law of evidence. And, as we have done before, we must once more protest against rashly tampering with this fundamental safeguard of all truth.

Now, according to the statements of the professors of Magnetism, there are four degrees of *lucidity*. 1. In the first, the patient becomes sensible of external objects by means of other organs than those usually employed. They see and hear, touch and smell by means chiefly of the epigastrium, instead of the eyes and ears.

2. In the second he is enabled to distinguish objects through opaque substances and at a considerable distance.

3. In the third he can look into himself and describe his own internal condition, and that of the parties with whom, to use the technical term, he is placed in magnetic relation.

4. He is endowed with a retrospective and prospective faculty, and knows a number of things, both past and future, with which he could not have become acquainted through the ordinary channels of knowledge.*

“ ‘ Marie,’ said a strange physician to a somnambulist, ‘ do you know me ?’ ‘ Yes, sir.’ ‘ Who am I ?’ ‘ You are a physician.’ ‘ Whence do I come ?’ ‘ From Chartres.’ ‘ Where is my house at Chartres ?’ ‘ In a small street running down a declivity.’ ‘ Can you see my house ?’ ‘ Yes, sir.’ ‘ Is there any company in it ?’ ‘ Yes, sir, four ladies, one old, two middle-aged, and one young lady.’ ‘ For what purpose have I come in this part of the country ?’ ‘ To see a female patient.’ ‘ Where is her complaint ?’ Here she pointed to the part affected, which we cannot just now recollect. ‘ Where did I dine ?’ ‘ At M’s.’ ‘ Was there a good dinner ?’ ‘ Yes, sir.’ ‘ Could you tell me what dishes we had ?’ ‘ Certainly.’ She names every dish, and its particular place on the table. ‘ What do I hold in my hand ?’ ‘ A small wooden box.’ ‘ What does it contain ?’ ‘ Sharp little iron tools.’ ‘ Now, what have

* Du Potet, p. 111.

I in my hand?' 'Some money.' 'How much?' She names the sum. 'In what coin?' She specifies the various coins. 'Can you tell me my thoughts at this moment?' 'Yes, sir.' 'Say it.' 'I dare not, I must not tell you.' 'Well, I will tell you, I think of giving you this money.' 'So you do, sir, but I could not say so.' All these answers were perfectly correct."^a

Now, to show that these are not purely modern notions, any one, who will look into the account of the trials so common in the middle ages for sorcery and witchcraft, will find many instances of very similar phenomena. And the translator or compiler of the Baron du Potet's work has done a great service to the cause of historical truth by comparing several instances of supposed witchcraft with the fact of magnetism. It is always gratifying to have reason to believe that statements are mainly true in fact, however mixed up with explanations and theories which may be false. With such authenticated phenomena before them our benighted ancestors took refuge for their solution in the influence of evil spirits;—an influence pronounced by Scripture to exist, the belief of which is perfectly compatible with all the truths of Christianity, and congenial to the very spirit of a humble, solemn, thoughtful, spiritualized Christian, placed upon earth by God for the very purpose of fighting a battle with the enemy of souls, the father of lies, and the worker of lying wonders. They were not blindly deluded as to facts which they appear to have scrutinized in many instances with full as much care as we employ in sifting the profession of Magnetism. They generalized with the same accuracy as we do, referring the facts to a general law and principle recognised by all the philosophy of the day.

We do not think their principle at all less incredible, or supported at all with less evidence than the principle which is chosen by this age. The existence of evil spirits, and their power, under God's permission, to distract and influence the human soul are two facts, not a whit less credible than the existence of the magnetic fluid and its professed operation on the nervous system under the direction of volition. And undoubtedly it is far more gratifying to see a religious idea, however encumbered with superstition and surrounded by imposture, predominating in the explanation of natural phenomena, than a too materialistic notion, which catches with delight at any thing which can make the movements of mind intelligible by assimilating them with the functions of matter.

However this may be, there is scarcely a single instance of what has for years been termed the superstitious credulity of our

* Extract from the *Journal de la Meuse* for Sept. 20, 1835. Du Potet, p. 109.

Christian forefathers, which has not now been raked up and dragged forward as an attestation to the truth of animal magnetism. The epileptic convulsions of possessed or bewitched persons, their insensibility to bodily pain, their faculty of distinguishing an object both close and distant with closed eyes, their sympathies with particular individuals, the power of the touch in calming or increasing the disorder, the strange language which it is known they have uttered, and which was made one of the criterions of a bewitched person, the influence of fascination, and the evil eye, even the preternatural lightness of the body which was to prevent them from sinking in the water, and sometimes, it was supposed, caused them to be raised up in the air; these, and the use of amulets and charms, are now at length gravely allowed in the enlightened nineteenth century to have been facts and truths; and no other fault is any longer found with the dark ages that gave them credence, except for an erroneous solution of mysteries which are allowed to be as yet unexplained.

If any one wishes to see the phenomena of Magnetism exhibited under a different name, he has only to look to the cases of supposed witchcraft collected by the celebrated Glanville in his *Saducismus Triumphatus*. The very concurrence of so many peculiarities is itself a strong evidence of truth. The date of the following abridged case, reported on oath, is 1657.

Richard Jones was one day stroked on the side by a woman, Jane Brooks, who also gave him an apple. He is seized with pain in the side, and after eating the apple becomes speechless. During his fits he used to see the same woman and her sister appearing to him, and would describe the clothes and habits they were in at the time, exactly as the constables and others found upon repairing to their house. This they often tried, proceeds the account, and always found the boy right in his description. He was examined before a magistrate at Castle Cary, and during the inquiry, the women coming into the room, he was immediately taken speechless. This occurred frequently. In one of his fits the woman was called to lay her hand on him, which she did, and he thereupon started and sprang out in a very strange and unusual manner. One of the justices, to prevent all possibility of legerdemain, caused every one else to stand off from the boy, while he held him himself. The youth being blindfolded, the justice called as if Brooks should touch him, but winked to others to do it, which two or three successively did, but the boy appeared not concerned. The justice then called on the father to take him, but had privately before desired one Mr. Geoffrey Strode to bring Jane Brooks to touch him, as he should call for his father; which was done, and the boy immediately sprang out

after a very odd and violent fashion. He was afterwards touched by several persons and moved not; but Jane Brooks being again caused to put her hand upon him, he started and sprang out twice or thrice as before. All this while he remained in his fit, and some time after; and being then laid on a bed the people present could not for a long time bend either of his arms or legs. Afterwards the woman, it is said, appeared to him and gave him twopence; this was several times put into the fire. When it was heated the boy fell sick, when it grew cold he recovered.

Now, it is to be observed, that this narrative of facts is as well authenticated as any common phenomenon of nature. It is attested upon oath, by a clergyman and magistrate, and the very result of the inquiry, that the poor woman was hung, proves that the inquiry itself could not have been careless or superficial. Moreover, as before observed, it exhibits a collection of peculiar circumstances, exactly like those of magnetism; but between the two there is no connection either of tone or theory. They are wholly independent evidences of separate experiments, and this is but one case out of numbers.

Perhaps the reader will be more alive to this consideration if we give him another testimony to similar facts, with the acknowledgment on the part of the witness that he cannot explain them, from no less a man than St. Augustine. In the tenth book of his Commentary on Genesis, there is one of the most profound, sober, and discriminative views of the spiritual nature of man in its relation to the senses, that is to be found in any author, ancient or modern. It is impossible to read it with the attention which it deserves, without being wonderfully struck with that singular combination of bold and penetrating metaphysical research, with deep Christian humility and piety, which mark the character of Augustine, and which probably could not have been formed, except by that melancholy process to which his fervent energetic mind was subjected in early life.

He tells several stories as illustrative of the state of Exstasis, and closes them with these words, which we should be glad to borrow for ourselves:—

“ Istarum visionum et divinationum causas et modos vestigare si quis potest, certoque comprehendere, eum magis audire vellem, quam de me expectari, ut ipse dissererem. Quid tamen putem, ita ut nec docti me tanquam confirmantem derideant, nec indocti tanquam docentem accipiant, sed utrique disceptantem et quærentem potius quam scientem, non occultabo. Ego visa ista omnia visis comparo somniantium. Sicut enim aliquando et hæc falsa, aliquando autem vera sunt, aliquando perturbata, aliquando tranquilla; ipsa autem vera, aliquando futuris omnino similia,

vel apertè dicta, aliquando obscuris significationibus et quasi figuratis locutionibus ferè enuntiata ; sic etiam illa omnia."

The parallel may be more striking, if we first read a remarkable case of Magnetism given by Mr. Du Potet.* The patient was a poor girl of the name of Caroline Baudoin, who had suffered frightfully from scrofula, and had been obliged in consequence to submit to amputation of the arm.

"Moved," says the Baron, "by the recital of her sufferings, I resolved upon magnetizing her, rather from an instinctive feeling that I might relieve her, than from any conviction that I could do her good, for I scarcely considered it possible to cure so inveterate a disease. In the course of three minutes magnetism she fell asleep, and began by telling me, that had she known me seven months sooner, she would not have lost her arm. It was only three months since she had been operated upon. She pointed out the means of healing the wounds on the arm and breast, and on these being applied they proved completely successful. The most important thing, however, remained to be effected, which was to change her constitution, or at least to modify it in such a manner as to prevent a recurrence of the previous eruption. Magnetism had produced a sufficient degree of lucidity to allow of her giving advice to other patients, but hitherto not enough to describe the means of curing herself. One day as she was prescribing for a patient whose recovery she was anxious to bring about, she interrupted the consultation, and told me that on the 24th of August, at nine in the evening, she should fall into a state of profound sleep, which would last for thirty hours ; that this sleep would be very calm, if during the two preceding days she was not annoyed by any thing, but otherwise she should be much agitated ; and that by an unaccountable feeling she should endeavour to eat her own flesh. She therefore desired that precautions might be taken to check this fatal propensity, and requested that she might be incessantly watched. She declared, further, that during this crisis of thirty hours, she would eat absolutely nothing ; and that the scrofulous matter would be carried out of her system. She also said, that during her sleep a *bruissement* would be heard at the epigastrium, caused by the flow of scrofulous humours. She then predicted her perfect recovery. This declaration was made on the 14th July, 1833. I made her repeat it on the 21st of the same month, *in the presence of fifteen persons, who drew up and signed a report to this effect, having previously taken care to ascertain her scrofulous state.* In the intervening period *many persons took cognizance of the declaration, and promised, if her prediction were fulfilled, to attest so remarkable a case.* On the 24th of August, at eight in the evening, it was arranged that *several persons should assemble in the hour of the patient at the Petit Carreau ; and I enjoined her attendants to put her to bed half an hour before the accession of her crisis, in order to prevent her being annoyed.* All this was punctually done. At nine o'clock *a number of visitors had congregated.* On arriving we were in-

* *Introduct. p. 186.*

formed that the crisis had declared itself a few minutes sooner than she had predicted, and that it was fully developed. On entering the room we saw the unfortunate girl with her face swelled, her tongue protruding out of her mouth, nearly, to all appearance, cut in two by her teeth, her limbs stiffened, and her jaws so firmly locked that it was impossible to open them. After having magnetised the masseter muscles, so as to remove the stiffness of the jaws, I caused the tongue to be drawn in, which was already very much discoloured, and fortunately had only been bitten very slightly. No one had yet perceived that one of her fingers had not only been bitten, but that there was a loss of substance, the piece wanting having been swallowed by her during her previous paroxysm. As the violence of the crisis continued, I thought it proper to remain with her during the ensuing thirty hours. I was perfectly right in having taken this resolution, for she struggled hard with extraordinary violence, and attempted to put her hand into her mouth to bite it again; but she had been so bound down that she could only get at the sheets, a piece of which she succeeded in tearing off. The somnambulic state at length terminated; her prediction was fulfilled; and she was, to the satisfaction of all the parties interested, from that day cured."

The instances mentioned by Augustin are these:—

"We know, as a positive fact," he says,* "the case of a person possessed by an unclean spirit, who, though confined to the house, was in the habit of announcing the approach of a certain priest, who came to visit him from a distance of twelve miles. He would describe him at every stage of his journey, where he was, how near, when he was on the point of entering the property, the house, and the chamber, until he came within sight. Although it was impossible for him to see this with his eyes, yet if he had not seen it in some way or another he could not have described it as he did with perfect truth. He was suffering from fever, and spoke as in a delirium. It may be," says Augustin, "that he really was in a delirium, and was therefore supposed to be possessed. He would receive no food from any one, not even from his relatives, only from this priest. He would struggle violently, and resist his own relatives with all his might. But the moment the priest came near him, he became quiet, and answered submissively. His mental aberration, however, or possession, whichever it was, did not give way to the priest. Nor did it leave him, till he was cured of his fever by ordinary processes, after which he never experienced any thing of the kind."

In the second instance occurs the phenomenon of the patient prescribing remedies for his own disorder, and anticipating his own cure, with the date of it, which forms so prominent a feature in Magnetism.

" 'There was with us, fuit apud nos, a boy, who, at the commencement of puberty, laboured under a very singular and dreadful disorder,' closely connected, it should be added, with the nervous system. 'His agony, though great, was not continual; when the fit came on, he would scream

* Comment De Genesi ad literam, lib. 12, c. 35.

and cry out with violence, and throw about his limbs as is usual in bodily sufferings, but without any loss of reason. Then in the midst of his ecstasies he would be wholly deprived of sense,' or as the original expresses it, more strongly, 'abripiebatur ab omnibus sensibus,' 'and with his eyes open, without seeing any of the bystanders, and not moving though pinched and pulled about, (ad nullam vellicationem se movens). After an interval he would wake up, free from pain, and describe what he saw. At the interval of a few days the same would occur again. In all or nearly all his visions, he used, as he said, to see two persons, one advanced in years, the other a boy, by whom he was shown or told what he afterwards narrated to us. On one occasion he saw a company of saints, singing hymns and rejoicing in a wonderful light, and a number of sinners in darkness, suffering various and frightful torments. They were shewn to him by these two persons, who pointed out to him at the same time the respective merits and condition of the parties. *This vision he saw on Easter-day, after having been free from pain during the whole of Lent*, although previously there had scarcely been an intermission of three days. *At the commencement of Lent he had seen these two persons, who promised him that he should suffer nothing during the forty days.* Afterwards they advised him, 'dederunt tanquam medicinale consilium,' to have an operation performed. 'This was done, and for a long time he remained free from pain; when it recurred, and the same visions returned, he was again advised by them to bathe in the sea. They promised him at the same time that the violent pain should cease, and that he should only be troubled with a continuance of one symptom (a flow of scrofulous humour); and so it followed; he never afterwards experienced any similar abstraction from sense, or saw any more visions. The remainder of his cure was effected by his physicians.' "

With Augustin we must leave the explanation of these facts to those who would profess to know more of the capabilities and condition of the human mind. As to the facts themselves, if any one is inclined to reject them as coming from an early Father, and that Father, as he is often called, a Monk, it will only show his ignorance of the character of Augustin, and of some of the most profound metaphysical inquiries existing in any language. It is, at least, impossible to throw them aside as contrary to the analogy of experience, until the exactly parallel cases of magnetism are wholly disproved. Separately we may all be inclined to doubt; together, like the two sides of an arch, they press and support each other.

The phenomena of second sight should also be brought to bear upon the question of magnetism. Society in Scotland may be very rude, and rude societies may be very superstitious, and many of the seeming predictions may be unfulfilled, and many more seem frivolous, or explicable by ordinary principles, but it is wholly contrary to analogy that the belief in such a faculty not limited to an individual, but occurring irregularly over whole

districts, and capable of being tested by the simplest observer, should exist as it has existed in Scotland, without at least some foundation for it. Aubrey and Frazer, Martin and Kirk, and Sacheverell, in his *Sketches of the Isle of Man*, will supply a sufficient collection of instances to illustrate the analogy between second sight and the clairvoyance of magnetism.

We would extract some at present, but that to heap marvels upon marvels is not the way to command that quiet and dispassionate view of the subject which we wish to recommend.

The facts themselves it may be wholly impossible to reduce to any known law of nature. But after making allowances for all exaggerations, impositions, and falsehoods, they cannot all be set aside without abandoning the corner-stone of evidence, testimony. When we have done this on one subject, it will be done by a very different class of persons in another. We shall introduce a general spirit of scepticism with regard to all things which are not familiar to our own experience. Our own individual reason will be set up as the touchstone of truth. And then our mode of treating the phenomena, even of Magnetism, may be only an illustration of that universal rationalism which is creeping over the whole field of human knowledge, and poisoning at its root religion as well as science.

But indeed the phenomena, even of lucidity, are after all not so far removed from our common experience. Where they are exhibited, through apparently some organs of sense, though different from the usual organs, as, for instance, through the skin, the occiput, the tips of the fingers, or the nerves of the epigastrium, a very little insight into the theory of sensation is sufficient to remove many difficulties.

From Aristotle down to the greatest modern chymists, all corporal sensation has been traced by the profoundest analysis to motion. Impact takes place upon the nerve, motion is produced, and sensation follows. Similar motions generate analogous sensations, the sound of a trumpet is compared to scarlet, the beauty of the eye and softness of touch, and by the most common metaphors, the affections of one sense denote the affections of others. When we consider that the skin, and especially the whole epigastric region, and the solar plexus, are immediately connected with the organs of sense, there is nothing so wholly incredible in the fact, that by some extraordinary perturbation of the nervous system, any or every part may be made as capable of conducting motion to the brain as the ear or the eye. And when the lucidity extends still farther to distant objects, past events or future contingencies, we can only answer, if the fact itself be established by testimony, that the nature of the mind itself, its power, and

range, and capability of development, are to us now and ever an impenetrable mystery. It may possess senses, of which, shut up as it now is in this dungeon of the body, we can form no conception whatever. There is such a thing as prophecy. There are presentiments, and anticipations, and sympathies, which make indeed tales for nurseries, but are also problems of philosophy. What (we think it is the observation of Dr. Reid) would a man say, who, being born blind, should be set to obtain an accurate knowledge of St. Paul's cathedral, of its dimensions, figures, sculpture, and materials by the touch alone; and who, after toiling year after year in forming the most vague conjectures on his object, should then be informed that there was a mode by which in five minutes he might pass along it, and above and about it, and measure every part, and arrange them all into a perfect picture, without moving from the place on which he stood? He would say it was impossible. Those who believed in the existence of such a faculty would be dreamers, and those who professed to possess it, impostors. And unless he chose to trust to testimony, the power and miracles of vision must continue to him wholly unknown.

And there may be an eye of the mind, of which at present we know nothing; and it may be opened, as the Bible speaks, by a hand from above, or illuminated with a supernatural light, or the veil now before it may be withdrawn, it may be by disease, or it may be by an energy of nature. And it may have, when thus excited, the power of penetrating and traversing, and recalling and connecting things and objects as far beyond the range of the eye of sense, as the concave of the dome of St. Paul's is removed from the touch of the blind. We do not know—we are very far from presuming to assert it—and those who even hint its possibility must appear visionaries and mystics. But we ask for the mode of disproving it; and till this is done, we insist that testimony, tried and proved testimony, to phenomena of the kind is to be received, with caution indeed and sobriety, but still with that wise faith which, knowing man's ignorance and weakness, does not dare to cramp and cut short the infinity of nature by the narrowness of our own experience.

One more phenomenon of Magnetism we mention briefly, that we may illustrate it as we have done others by reference to a passage from antiquity which lies before us. When the patient is placed in communication, *en rapport*, with his magnetiser, a remarkable relation, it is said, is established between them. Singular sympathies follow, and almost a transfusion of ideas, sensations and faculties takes place from one to the other. It is interesting to see an allusion to the same fact in the *Theages* of

Plato, as connected with the Genius of Socrates. It would be very easy to accumulate instances of a similar superstition, if we choose to call it so, from other writers, but this happens to be at hand. The *Theages* is indeed supposed to be a spurious dialogue, but it is at any rate a production of great philosophy, and the facts themselves are referred to in the *Thætetus* and other acknowledged works of Plato.

“ ‘There has followed me,’ says Socrates, ‘from a child, by a dispensation of heaven, a supernatural power. It is a voice, which, whenever it occurs, always warns me to abstain from that which I am about to do. It never advises me to do any thing. And if any one of my friends communicates with me, and the voice occur, it warns him also against his intention, and prohibits him from acting accordingly. I will mention witnesses of the fact. You know Charmides, the son of Glaucon. He happened one day to be speaking to me on the subject, as he was preparing to practise for the stadium at Nemea. The moment he began to speak I heard the voice. I told him of it, and endeavoured to dissuade him. Perhaps, he replied, it only means that I shall not win the race; but even if I do not succeed, it will do me good to practise. He did practise, and you may ask him yourself what happened to him. Ask Clitomachus also, the brother of Timarchus, what Timarchus told him when he and his companion were about to die. Clitomachus, he said, I am now about to die, because I refused to take the warning of Socrates. And why Timarchus said this I will explain. He and Philemon were at a party where I was present the night when they were preparing to assassinate Nicias. No one knew of the plot but themselves. Timarchus rose up from his seat, and bidding us continue at our wine, stated that he was obliged to go away, but would soon return. Upon which I heard the voice, and immediately begged him to remain, for I had heard the usual supernatural sign. He stopped for a short time, and after an interval again made an effort to retire, telling me that he was going. And again I heard the voice, and compelled him to remain. The third time, wishing to escape without my seeing him, he rose up without saying a word to me, watching his opportunity while I was otherwise occupied. And then he committed the crime for which he was to be put to death. With respect again to the Sicilian expedition, many persons will tell you what I prophesied of the destruction of the army. And you may have at the present moment an opportunity of trying the accuracy of the sign. For when Sannion was preparing to join the troops the voice occurred, and I cannot but believe that he will be killed, or something will happen to him.’

“ ‘I have mentioned to you,’ he adds, ‘these facts, because this same supernatural faculty is of force, and of the greatest force, in my intercourse with friends and pupils. Some it is opposed to, and those persons can derive no benefit from my society; and I am unable to associate with them. Many it does not positively reject, and yet they obtain no benefit from me; but in every case where you have perceived that any great progress has been made, there has been the sanction and co-ope-

ration of this super-human power. And even of those who do make a progress, some retain the good they derive from me for a long time, others advance rapidly while they are with me, but the moment they are separated, become no better than the rest. This was particularly the case with Aristides, the son of Lysimachus. While he used to live with me he made a very great advance in a very short time. After this he sailed with an expedition. And on his return found Thucydides with me, with whom the day before I had slightly quarrelled. When Aristides saw me, after the usual salutations, he observed, that he had heard Thucydides giving himself airs, and finding fault with me as if he were somebody, when all the world knew what a dolt he had been before he had associated with me. As for myself, said Aristides, my case is ridiculous. Before I sailed on the expedition I could dispute and argue with any one, and delighted in the society of the most accomplished men; now I shrink from the very sight of an educated person, and blush at my own stupidity. And did this power, said I, leave you all at once, or little by little? Little by little. And when you possessed it, was it through any thing which you learned from me? Socrates, he replied, I will tell you, what, incredible as it may seem, is yet perfectly true. I never learned any thing whatever from you, as you well know; but I used to make a progress in knowledge whenever I was with you, even if I were in the same house, without being in the same room; yet still more, if I was in the same room. And as I used to think, if when in the same room and you were speaking I looked towards you, I advanced more than if my eyes were turned in any other quarter. But by far the greatest progress was made when I sat by your side, and had hold of you and touched you. But now, he added, all this habit and faculty has melted away and is lost.' "—*Plato, Theages*, p. 210.

We are far from adducing such passages as these as testimony to the facts themselves of Magnetism, but they are interesting parallels, if nothing more, and as such may deserve attention.

These observations on the phenomena themselves attributed to the magnetic state, have extended to such a length that there is no space to allude, except very briefly, to the mode in which they are said to be produced.

On reviewing the History of Magnetism, the changes which have been made in the theory of it, are sufficient of themselves to make any sober-minded reasoner pause in his conclusion. The original school of Mesmer* operated chiefly by physical means, as by the touch and pressure of the hand, the use of metal conductors, magnetised water, music and light; not to mention the infection and sympathies of a number of persons, and brought together under similar exciting circumstances. The second school, established by Barbarin at Lyons and Ostend, omitted the physical treatment, and confined themselves to the influence of faith in the

* Colquhoun's *Animal Magnet.* vol. i. c. 12.

recipient and volition in the operator. The third school was that of the Marquis de Puysegur at Strasburg, and combined the treatments adopted by the two former. In the words of Mr. Colquhoun :—

“ The whole magnetic treatment was conducted in a manner the best calculated to insure the repose and comfort of the patient. The manipulations, when employed, were extremely gentle ; and the hands, instead of being brought into contact with the patient, were frequently kept at some distance from her. In consequence of this mode of treatment, there ensued crises of a quite different kind from those which were known to Mesmer and his immediate disciples ; the most agreeable feelings were experienced ; the intellectual faculties appeared to be wonderfully increased and exalted, and in the higher stages the patient exhibited a very delicate knowledge of his own bodily state, as well as of the internal condition of such other patients as were placed in magnetic connection with them.”

The present opinion seems to be, that neither metal conductors nor manipulations are necessary, but that the magnetiser may operate by breathing, or by fixing the eyes, or the thoughts, or both, steadily and intensely upon the patient. Intense volition is in fact the principal agent.

Now it is certain, in the first place, that the phenomena of magnetism have been, and are at this time, proved to take place beyond a doubt in certain diseased state of the nervous system, without the intervention of any operator. It is certain also that the action of the mind alone is in many instances capable of throwing persons into a state in which the same separation takes place between the mind and the body as in the crisis of somnambulism. Thus violent emotions produce faintings, wanderings of thought, and insensibility to pain.

But, perhaps, one of the most powerful influences of this kind is to be found in a species of moral fascination. The readiness with which weak minds will render themselves up to the control of another, follow it in all its movements, abandon themselves to every impulse when once the consciousness of self-control is lost, and are thus hurried on, not only into bodily convulsions, but extravagances of all kinds, and especially into those sympathetic impulses which are adduced as proofs of the magnetic attraction, but which, perhaps, ought properly to be viewed as very disordered and dangerous excesses of a diseased sensibility. Every one is conscious of the power exerted by the human eye. Every one has felt something of that kind of shock which occurs when persons, as it is commonly said, begin to understand, to sympathize with each other, to see through that external veil of forms which is interposed by nature and society between mind and

mind. It is this principle which gives eloquence its greatest powers, and enables popular leaders to exercise such a command over the multitude. Much of the extravagances of Methodism at its first rise may be traced to this cause. And it is singular to observe what a remarkable parallelism may be traced between the phenomena which accompanied them and those of magnetism. Bishop Lavington (*Enthusiasm of Methodism*) contains a number of striking cases. Compare, for instance, the following account with the French report on the effects of Mesmerism.*

“ While he was preaching, one woman suddenly cried out as in the agonies of death, continued so for some time with all the signs of the sharpest anguish.—One felt as it were the piercing of a sword, and could not avoid crying out even in the street.—A young man suddenly seized with trembling all over, sunk down to the ground.—One and another and another sunk to the earth.—They dropt on every side as thunder-struck.—A woman broke out into strong cries, great drops of sweat ran down her face, and all her bones shook.—One fallen raving mad, changed colour, fell off his chair, screams terribly, beats himself against the ground.—Some torn with a convulsive motion in every part of their bodies so violently that four or five persons could not hold them.—Others were laughing almost without ceasing, and thus continued for two days.—Between two or three I was waked, and immediately heard such a confused noise, as if a number of men were all putting to the sword.”

But, besides these violences, there are to be found in the early history of methodism, visions, cures made and anticipated with dates, prophecies, speaking with strange tongues and voices, clairvoyance; even that particular sense of formication and chill, which is so often spoken of as an incipient symptom of somnambulism, the appearance of light, which is supposed to be the magnetic fluid itself, only visible to the patient in the most advanced stages of magnetism, rigidity of limbs, and all the other symptoms of epileptic and magnetic affections. And the same is to be observed in all the remarkable instances of enthusiasm, whether religious or not, of which we possess authentic records.

It is impossible not to conclude that if such are the effects of a highly excited state of mind, without any intervention of the magnetic fluid, the fluid itself may well be dispensed with. And until these phenomena are regularly producible without the knowledge or concurrence in any way of the party affected, we are certainly justified in supposing that we are indebted for them principally, if not wholly, to himself. Instances, indeed, have been brought forward where persons supposed to be unconscious

* *Wesley's Journal*, vol. iii. p. 23.

of the presence of the magnetiser, infants, and even animals, have been thrown into the crisis of somnambulism ; and these are the kind of fact to be most narrowly scrutinized. But we confess they are very rare and as yet unsatisfactory. No theory of magnetism has yet wholly excluded moral influences. Moral influences we know are sufficient to produce nearly all, if not all the phenomena ; and the physical agency therefore requires separate and distinct proof.

This and the last question originally proposed as to the analogy or identity of the fluid, supposing it to exist, with the principle of electricity, are certainly not yet capable of solution, until many more experiments have been made, and experiments particularly directed to this point.

It is unnecessary, however, to trespass farther. There has been no wish to decide in any way on any of the questions suggested, but to throw out some warnings as to the spirit with which they ought to be examined by a Christian philosopher.

Of the possibility of the phenomena themselves taking place spontaneously in a morbid state of nerves, there can be little doubt, unless we choose to annihilate the authority of the most varied and tried external testimony. That a very considerable proportion of cases are the result of imposition, self-delusion, abandonment to exciting influences, personal vanity, in being made the object of curiosity and observation, the contagion of sympathy and imitation, there can be still less doubt.

That Magnetism, instead of being a science, is in its present state nothing but a species of quackery, is also evident. The effects of the treatment are perfectly precarious, sometimes ending in a cure, sometimes in insanity. The treatment is reduced to no fixed rules, and is acknowledged to be full of hazard. The persons susceptible of the influence, are those who labour under indefinite disorders, weak women, children, persons of an irritable, nervous temperament, epileptic patients, and the like, in whom the conditions of disease being unknown, the principles of cure must be unknown likewise. And the qualifications of the operators themselves are equally undetermined. To call Magnetism, therefore, a science, is an unpardonable presumption.

To expect from it any great harm to the cause of religious truth, is a very needless fear. To expect from it any great good to any one, is to be far too sanguine. If its effects are corporeal they must be ranked with all the other remedies of medicine, which may alleviate pain and disease in some shape, but still leave the great bulk of bodily infirmities beyond the reach of man—one sickness springing up where another has been displaced, and the great source of all our evils, the “mind diseased,” remaining still

“unministered to,” and unhealed. And if its action be mental, is it necessary to ask if ecstasies and convulsions and somnolency, and lucidity, or any other extravagancies of a mind withdrawn from self-control, and preternaturally excited, are the means by which we are to operate upon the intellect and affection of men? Can mechanical influence make us either wise or good or happy? And where no such effect is producible, where is the cause either for curiosity or exultation, beyond the feeling with which we regard any common discovery of science?

But it is of very great importance that we should be prepared to examine and prove the pretensions of science in a right and Christian spirit—to be observant, humble, willing to receive truth, not bigoted to our own prejudices, nor hastily credulous of others. And yet in a Christian, credulity is far wiser and far better than scepticism; and it does not preclude a very narrow scrutiny into facts, to be willing to receive them when properly supported. There is no cast of mind so truly philosophical as that of a Catholic Christian. It cannot close its ears against wonders, while it is surrounded by wonders on all sides. But it cannot be led away by them, because it is satisfied with those which it possesses already, and has no appetite for change, nor expectation of improvement, except from energies and influences far beyond the reach of human discovery. And in the case of magnetism, as in all others, it is willing to be guided by the rules of Lord Bacon, where he is speaking in a very bold, but very philosophic spirit, of such subjects in general.*

“Men are to be admonished that they do not withdraw credit from the operations by transmissions of spirits, and force of imagination, because the effects fail sometimes, for in impressions from mind to mind, or from spirit to spirit, the impression taketh, but is encountered and overcome by the mind and spirit, which is passive, before it worketh any manifest effect.

“Men are to be admonished, on the other side, that they do not easily give place and credit to these operations, because they succeed many times, for the cause of this success is oft to be truly ascribed unto the force of affection and imagination upon the body agent.”

And again,

“Men are to be admonished, that as they are not to mistake the causes of these operations, so much less they are to mistake the fact or effect, and rashly to take that for done which is not done.

“And we, to continue in his words, that hold firm to the works of God, and to the sense, which is God’s lamp, *lucerna Dei spiraculum*

* Natural History, Cent. x. c. 901.

hominis, will inquire with all sobriety and severity, whether there be to be found in the footsteps of nature any such transmission and influx of immateriate virtues—and what the force of imagination is either upon the body imaginant, or upon any other body—wherein, if we like that labour of Hercules in purging the stable of Augeas, to separate from superstitious and magical arts and observations, any thing that is clean and pure natural, and not to be either contemned, or condemned."

ART. IV.—*A Treatise on the Church of Christ, designed chiefly for the use of Students in Theology.* By the Rev. W. Palmer, M.A. of Worcester College, Oxford. 2 vols. Rivingtons.

It has been long observed and lamented, that rich as our theology is, both in writers and in works, we have very few large systematic treatises for the use of our clergy and divinity students, such as abound in other religious communities. We have no ecclesiastical historian as Fleury or Mosheim, no fully furnished polemic as Bellarmine, and no dogmatic writer whom we can compare to Petavius or Vasquez. Pearson's work indeed on the Apostles' Creed is a methodical treatise, but not even the lapse of nearly three centuries has given us a standard expositor of the Thirty-nine Articles. Our theology has proceeded in another direction. As a living writer has observed, it has been called forth by the pressure of external and occasional circumstances. It has not been for the most part the production of men detached from secular connections, or blessed with the solitude of the cloister,—men who lived for the completion of great works, and whose employments were determined from within, but of those who had the charge of parishes or dioceses, or were confronted with opposition, or stimulated by contemporaneous events. There are indeed some great exceptions, such as Pearson's Comment, already noticed, Bingham's Antiquities, and Taylor's Ductor Dubitantium;—but on the whole our divines have written, because they were obliged to write, and so far as they were obliged. They have written answers to particular assailants, have grown out of pamphlets into folios, and, like great musicians, have worked out profound movements from subjects which the chance of the moment offered. Thus the works of Jewell, Bramhall, Horsley, and Waterland, are in great measure the gradual increase of controversy with a disputant, developing itself in fresh and fresh replies, handling and elaborating the same matter again and again. Hooker is almost all through his writings engaged

with Travers, Cartwright, or their fellows; Bull in his more considerable works with Petavius, Episcopius, or Luther. Stillingfleet often requires a comment in the words of adversaries to illustrate him. Leslie is controversial from first to last.

This peculiarity of English divinity has its advantages and its evils. There is in consequence vastly more character and life in it than in the divinity of other schools. Men wrote because they felt,—when their feelings were excited, and their hearts thrown open. About Hooker there is the charm of nature and reality; he discourses, not as a theologian, but as a man; and we see in him what otherwise might have been hidden, poetry and philosophy informing his ecclesiastical matter. In spite of his method and exactness, he preaches as well as proves, and his discussions are almost sermons. Bull, again, is, beyond his other traits, remarkable for discursiveness. He is full of digressions, which can only be excused because they are so instructive and beautiful. If he is often rhetorical, he is never dry; and never tires, except from the abundance of his matter. The same remark applies *mutatis mutandis* to Pearson's *Vindiciæ* and Wall's *Infant Baptism*. These are certainly advantages, and yet the disadvantages are not less. Works which have been called forth by particular circumstances require a knowledge of these circumstances to understand them. The late Bishop Lloyd used to say with much truth, that if we did but know the respective occasions which led St. Paul to write his Epistles, we should at once have the best of comments upon them. The case is much the same as regards our theological writers. A knowledge of the history of their times is one main step towards understanding them. This is a considerable difficulty in the way of making use of them. They are uninviting on first taking up, as requiring some effort of mind in the reader, as alluding to matters of which perhaps he knows little, or as plunging at once into a subject of which he has to learn the rudiments. Again, it is difficult to find in them any particular point which we may want to see discussed. We cannot be sure that the subject will be exhausted, or if so, in what order; before we can make them books of reference, we must have mastered them from beginning to end. And then moreover the most important parts often come in by the by where one would least expect it, their treasures lying like those of nature in veins and clefts of the rock, not sorted and set out to advantage as in a market. All this has a tendency to perplex the mind of the student; and in fact nothing is more common than to hear it asked by clergymen, when urged to give attention to theology, “where am I to begin, how am I to get

into the subject? I open a book, and read some pages, and shut it in despair of making any thing of my experiment." And even when a student has mastered some great work of our theology, the idea of its subject left upon his mind is often not more complete and adequate than that (to use a familiar illustration) which a ride across country gives of the relative position and importance of the tracts passed over, or which a stroll along green lanes affords of the *lie* of the neighbouring fields and villages. An experienced eye will be instructed, but a stranger will be at once enchanted and perplexed, and will either recollect little of what has passed before him, or will regard it as a picture rather than a reality. And, moreover, if an inquirer be ill-disposed to receive what he reads, this appearance of unreality will greatly strengthen his prejudice against it. Harmony of parts is the external test of a view being real. When one thing fits into another, when each part mutually supports and is supported, when a theory is equal to account for all questions, and thus is, in a certain sense, self-balanced and self-sustained and entire, we have a *φαινόμενα* of truth forced upon our minds, even against our will. In this lies the attraction whether of the Roman or the Calvinistic theology, that, at first sight at least, each theory has no flaws. Now when this appearance is gained by exceeding the limits of the revealed word, as we conceive it is in the case of those theologies, it is a mere substitution of reason for faith; but as far as revelation has joined truths together, and has made one depend and throw light on another, it is not for us to put asunder, what, when viewed as one, enlists the reason, or at least the imagination, on its side. Facts are improbable only so far as they are isolated; what is called giving causes to them is in truth only giving them a connection with other facts. They are said to be accounted for, when they are made parallel with each other, when marshalled in line, and reduced in theory to one common principle. Such is the rhetorical effect of order upon the beholder, whether we call it *consistency* as in morals, or a *law* as in physics, or *design* as in religion, or *system* as in divinity. And its persuasiveness seems to proceed on the latent principle, that, since nothing that is self-destructive can really exist, or that contains in it the seeds of self-destruction, or, in other words, since the results of one thing must, as proceeding from one, harmonize and duly adjust with each other, and whereas in consequence things which are discordant cannot result from one principle, therefore there is a probability at first sight that various phenomena, found together, and withal consistent and uniform, do belong, and therefore do witness to, some one real principle ex-

isting as the cause of them. Now English theology and English treatises are deficient in this internal presumption of truth, and in consequence are at a disadvantage when an inquirer is suspicious or hostile. Not only are our best writers but partially systematic, but one writer can often, fairly or unfairly, be brought to oppose another, till our edifice seems from foundation to summit to be rather a random heap of stones cast together from without, than a living body developing and expanding itself from within. Hasty reasoners, then, instead of viewing it as a theology, or separating what really belongs to it from what is adventitious or accidental, refer its actual parts to distinct sources, Roman, Lutheran, or Calvinistic, and refuse to consider Anglicanism as any thing more than a name for a certain assemblage, in time and place, of heterogeneous materials.

The treatise before us is the work of a man who is evidently alive to this inconvenience, which attaches to our Church's present position; accordingly it is a careful laying out or mapping of the province of theology, as regards some of its most important departments; being divided into four parts,—on the notes of the Church as applied to existing Christian communities, on the theological aspect of the British Reformation, on Scripture and Tradition, and on the Authority of the Church; and though this division does not pretend to be very scientific, the separate heads give promise of the methodical treatment of great matters, and the discussions which respectively follow them amply fulfil it.

And it will be found of advantage, as directed against a distinct class of misapprehensions from those of which we have hitherto spoken. It does the Church a service, not only of a remedial nature, with reference to the immethodical divinity of the 17th century, but also as regards the meagre and attenuated divinity of the 18th, though we suppose the author did not intend it. There are at this day, as in the last century, a vast number of religious persons, who think that there is no such science as divinity, or, to speak more correctly, that though there be, yet it has no concern with religion, but rather is prejudicial to it. This opinion must necessarily follow the ultra-Protestant theory, that every man is his own divine; that divinity, of which every man is capable, being in fact nothing at all. Accordingly it is not unusual, in certain quarters, to speak as if vital truth lay, as it is sometimes expressed, "in a nutshell," as if there was nothing to learn, nothing to determine. Because Scripture speaks of faith being all in all, and the apostles say "repent" or "believe in Christ," or "obey," persons consider, sometimes that religion is a certain apprehension of the merits of Christ, and nothing

more, sometimes that it is sincerity and morality, and nothing more. Now it is evidently a great assistance to such speculators, to remove from public view all appearance of a theological system. If persons can be got to forget the fact that there is such a thing as a science professing to be divine in origin as well as matter, then they will be more easily persuaded that each man can be his own teacher. There is on the face of the case no reason they should not be. Those who maintain the necessity of teachers, are met with the previous question, whether there is any thing to teach. The unlearned condition, then, of our Church during the last century, has favoured the growth of ultra-Protestantism, not only as letting slip the means by which it was to be refuted in detail, but as confirming its main position concerning private judgment, by tacitly allowing, as a point confessed on all hands, that there was nothing which individuals might not teach themselves,—that in fact there was no real body of doctrine, no matter of instruction forthcoming,—that faith had no objective character, but was either an internal feeling on the one hand, or a good life on the other. This benefit then, if no other, and a great one it is, results from works such as that before us, that the author has claimed for us, or rather reclaimed, a territory, where none was before suspected,—that he has opened the windows which were blocked up, and let in light upon our prison house, and showed us the fair and rich country which is our portion by inheritance. He has pointed out large and great questions more or less bearing upon our personal interests, our most sacred duties, and our future prospects, which individuals cannot settle for themselves, in which they must depend on others, in which, from the nature of the case, the Divine Will must be, that they should accept such guidance as promises fairest, and should abandon both extremes, whether of seeking an infallible assurance of their spiritual safety, or of acquiescing in a worldly security. This is the true exercise of private judgment, and to this Mr. Palmer's book leads,—not the taking up as truth what comes first, or what we like,—but in patiently guiding ourselves amid the obscurities of our actual position, by such helps as seem most probably to come from the Father of Lights, and in using which we shall best approve ourselves to Him.

There is another reflection which suggests itself from an inspection of Mr. Palmer's work, as compared with some other living writers of our Church. In all important matters, as being of the same communion, he cannot but agree with them; yet he so far differs from them in detail as to show he cannot be called in any true sense of one school or party with them. No one

can be ignorant that in the last few years there has been a remarkable return in our Church to sounder principles than have been for many years in fashion. It is not wonderful that the phenomenon should be attributed, by those who did not share in it, to the influence of certain places or persons. They were obliged to do so, by their own disagreement with them; it was a position almost necessary to be assumed in order to prove that the opinions in question were not true. It accounted for their rise and extension, which otherwise might be referred to their intrinsic claims upon attention. Now this theory, for it is merely such, is exposed, as soon as examination is made into the writings of the different persons who are the subjects of this criticism. The characteristic of a party theology is a sameness of view in minor matters; whereas it is undeniable, that in the disquisitions of Mr. Hook, Mr. Keble, Mr. Woodgate, and our present author, we have traces of schools of thought as distinct from each other as is the history of the respective writers themselves. Mr. Palmer, if we are not mistaken, came to Oxford from Dublin; and his work is as independent of the other divines mentioned, as has been his theological education.

And this variety in minor matters between writers, who one and all are upholding the great principles of the English Church, leads to a still further reflection,—that her scientific system is not yet sufficiently cleared and adjusted. In all the great questions of faith and practice, her voice has ever been plain and decisive; always sufficient for the guidance and comfort of her members. But, it is not to be denied, that as regards the intellectual expression of certain truths, or the due developement of them, or their bearings upon each other, or their relative importance, much remain to be done. Many difficulties remain to be sifted and settled; the points of mutual agreement, the limits of fair compromise, the line between open and close questions, the generalized forms of parallel views, the best modes of teaching, and the best modes of attacking, and the best modes of receiving an attack, are still to be ascertained in a variety of matters. The view to be taken of history and prophecy, of the world and of the civil power, of other branches of the Church, of outlying bodies, the rules of Scripture interpretation,—these and other most important matters, have, we do not say, to be determined, for some of them never will be, but to be thoroughly examined, that we may know just where we are, and where others are. And at present each fresh writer is, in some sense of the word, an experimentalist, endeavouring by his researches into Antiquity, and the exercise of a calm and subtle judgment, to develope

justly and accurately, under present circumstances, and in our existing medium of thought and expression, that truth which the apostles left behind them.

Mr. Palmer has brought to this work very remarkable powers of mind. We use the word "remarkable" with a definite meaning. No one is a good critic about the ability of a writer to whom he comes as to a teacher; this is our disadvantage; but in spite of it, let us be allowed to say what has struck us concerning this author, as a hint to other readers. If then, any one takes up Mr. Palmer's work with the expectation of having the evidence of originality or power forced upon him by it, he will be much disappointed. Though Mr. Palmer often warms with his subject, and writes eloquently, yet we doubt whether there is one sentence which men far inferior to Mr. Palmer might not have written. Persons might take it up and lay it down, and wonder what the author was aiming at, accuse it of indecision or inconsistency, or pronounce it to be a feeble production of a very learned man. Its learning, indeed, and its great value as a learned work, no one could doubt; but those who dip into it will most probably resign themselves to the conclusion, that it is a useful book of reference for facts, and nothing more. A closer study of it, however, on the part of such persons, would probably change their opinion; and they would gradually discover that underneath the unpretending exterior which it assumes, it is the subtle working out of a system upon a few great principles, which sometimes come to the surface, but are generally hidden. It is an attempt, well weighed and wrought out with great patience and caution, to form a theory of the Church, out of the phenomena before our eyes which it presents in the different parts of Christendom, which shall be at once conformable to ancient doctrine on the subject, and to the necessities of the modern English Church; an attempt to place us in a position in which we can defend ourselves against both Romanists and sectaries; an attempt to which, as far as we can judge, the facts of the whole work are made subservient from beginning to end, though of course we have not actually traced it out except in parts, or with equal certainty everywhere in these, or have mastered the drift and bearings of other portions of it. And we conceive that Mr. Palmer's view is as original in itself, as it is subtly carried out; by which word we neither express praise or blame, but merely mean to say, that, while defending many Catholic truths, he has placed them in a light which has not commonly been adopted by other writers. Without further preface we shall now attempt to draw out some portions of his view, passing, as it does, from positions in which all Churchmen

are pretty nearly agreed, to others about which they may fairly differ.

Men find themselves then in this world, he seems to say, (though we are constituting ourselves his interpreters,) with many spiritual wants, with a consciousness that they need a revelation and a desire to receive it. For a long while Providence left them in this unsatisfactory state with no certain communications from Him; nay, to this day such is the state of the greater part of the world. But he has blessed us with a message from him, the Gospel, to teach us how to please him and attain to heaven; he has given us *directions* what to do. So far all parties, Romanist, Sectarian, and Anglo-Catholic agree; but now comes the turning question, *where* those directions are, and *what*? The Ultra-Protestant says they are in the Bible, in such sort that any individual taking it up for himself, in a proper spirit, may, by divine blessing, learn thence without external help, "what he must do to be saved." On the other hand, Mr. Palmer (without of course infringing upon his reverence for the Bible as God's gracious gift to us, as inspired, and as the record of the whole revealed faith) maintains that not the Bible, but the Church is, in matter of fact, our great divinely appointed guide into saving truth, under divine grace, whatever be the *abstract* power or sufficiency of the Bible. As the Ultra-Protestant would say to an inquirer,—“Read the Bible for yourself,” so we conceive Mr. Palmer would make him reply,—“How can I, except some man should guide me?” He would consider the Church to be practically “the pillar and ground of the truth;” an informant given to all people, high and low, that they might not have to wander up and down and grope in darkness, as they do in a state of nature.

Then comes the question at once, *where* is the Church? we all know where the Bible is; it is a printed book, translated into English; we can buy it and use it; but where are we to find the Church, and what constitutes consulting and hearing it? Thus we are brought to the first subject which engages Mr. Palmer's attention, viz. the Notes of the Church, the criteria by which she is discriminated and known to be God's appointed messenger or prophet. And here, at very first sight, it is plain that if the Church is to be an available guide to poor as well as rich, unlearned as well as learned, its notes and tokens must be very simple, obvious, and intelligible. They must not depend on education, or be brought out by abstruse reasoning; but must at once affect the imagination and interest the feelings. They must bear with them a sort of internal evidence, which supersedes further discussion and makes their truth *self-evident*. This is the

way in which, as it would appear, the Bible affects us. It carries with it, in its style, matter, and claims, internal marks of something unearthly and awful. Such evidence may of course be disparaged by sophistry, or the Bible itself may be put out of sight; still these possible contingencies are no disparagement to the innate and practical influence of the Bible in convincing men of its own divinity. And similar evidences of course we are bound to find of the Church's divinity; not such as cannot possibly be explained away or put out of sight, but which, if allowed room to show themselves, will persuade the many that she is what she professes to be, God's ordained teacher in the way to heaven.

Mr. Palmer is fully sensible of the necessity of plainness and simplicity in the Notes of the Church. Indeed he takes this necessity for granted as an axiom, and uses it freely as an argument for or against particular points in debate. We notice this because it will serve as an instance to illustrate what we have said above, of his work being at first but partially intelligible to readers, from their not understanding the principles on which it is conducted. For instance, the following passages, excepting the first, which is explicit, might easily be criticized by persons who opened the book at random, though they are really but simple and natural exhibitions of his main position.

He says, in defence of the English Church,—

“It is true that several of our doctrines are carped at by various communities around us. The Romanists accuse us of heresy on several points. We deny the charge most absolutely and peremptorily. *Is it necessary to go into an examination of all these points on which the Church is assailed by her adversaries before we join her communion? Were this the case, few men would ever be enabled to unite themselves to her, even though she be the Church of God, in which salvation is offered; because their lives would be spent in investigating critically all these controversies of faith. It cannot be needful, for example, to enter into the controversies concerning the Trinity, incarnation, original sin, predestination, the sacraments, the power of the Roman pontiff, the forms of Church government, &c. &c., and to master them all before we unite ourselves to the Church. This would impose an impenetrable bar in the way of those who are called by God to unite themselves without delay to the Christian and Catholic Church, and to receive from her, as “the pillar and ground of truth,” that instruction and guidance which she is authorized by God and aided by his Holy Spirit to bestow.*”—vol. i. p. 244.

In the following passages, however, the same principle is merely assumed, viz., that no difficulty can exist really in finding the Church:—

“The Churches of England did not necessarily change their religion

because in one age certain opinions and practices were introduced, and in another were corrected or removed. To prove that the Church of England differs, in articles of faith, from her belief in any former age, *it would be necessary to go into a very long examination of particular doctrines, and of the mode and degree in which they have been held by the Church in different ages, which would obviously lead to great inconvenience; for the great body of mankind are totally incapable of instituting such a comparison. Therefore this objection cannot afford any excuse for being separate from our branch of the Catholic Church.*"—vol. i. pp. 245, 246.

Again :—

"As to the other Western synods which were previously held, and which are said to contradict our doctrine, we are prepared to show that they were merely particular synods, not confirmed by Catholic authority; and, moreover, the several of those objected in no degree differ from our doctrine. *This is the position we maintain; but to enter* [that is, for the *inquirer* to enter] *"into a particular examination whether it is well or ill-founded, cannot be requisite to determine whether the Church of England is a portion of the Catholic Church; because it would lead to lengthened investigations which must be impossible to the great majority of men. Suffice it to say, that we are prepared to prove that the Catholic Church has never condemned any doctrine which we maintain. This being the case, there can be no presumption of our heresy in any point."*—vol. i. p. 230.

And again :—

"The mere fact of differences in religion, proves nothing as to the heresy of either party; and the English, and other Churches which differ in some points from her, may yet all be connected by this unity of the Catholic Faith. To prove that either of them is separated from this unity, *we must enter into a most extensive examination of doctrines in controversy, with a view not merely to ascertain what the truth of Revelation really is, but to determine whether it is believed or denied by particular Churches; or whether the difference is apparent rather than real; whether it is a difference between individuals or Churches; and, finally, whether it is obstinately maintained. The inconvenience of such a process, and its unsuitableness to the great mass of mankind for the discovery of the true Church, is sufficiently obvious.*"—vol. i. p. 231.

Such are Mr. Palmer's initial principles, that the Gospel is to be learned by the individual from the Church; and that the Church is to be known by certain Notes or tokens; and that these Notes are of an obvious and popular character. We come next to the question what these Notes are; and, taking the Creed for his guide, he has no difficulty in answering. Thence he learns that the Church must be *One*, must be *Holy*, must be *Catholic*, and must be *Apostolic*. These characters he sets down as her Notes. That existing body in any country which bears these

marks, he would determine to be that Church once for all set up from the beginning, from which Christ has willed that individuals should learn the words of eternal life.

It is not to our purpose here to enter into the meaning of these characteristics, or to show that they are practically sufficient for the purpose for which they are assigned. We believe them so to be, but we are quite aware that the general opinion of the day will be against both Mr. Palmer and ourselves. This, however, we regard very lightly, and recommend Mr. Palmer to do the same. We disregard it because it is merely the opinion of the day; a long day perhaps, above a hundred years past, still a day which had a beginning and assuredly will have an end.

“ The longest day,
Live till to-morrow, will have passed away.”

So says the poet, and we trust we shall see it fulfilled in the present instance. The English people have had all along the privilege of the Church's presence among them, but their governors have done their best to hide her characteristic badges. At no time, indeed, could they really rob her of what was part of herself, the stamp of features and the royal stature which her Maker gave her; but they have kept her out of the light that she might not be seen, or have put tawdry or homely attire upon her that she might not attract attention. They have shut her up within walls, that, if so be, she might cease to be “ Catholic;” have made her eat and drink with sectaries that she might forget her “ Apostolic ” birth; and, as she could not appear “ Holy ” while she suffered the latter indignity, neither could she seem “ One ” while she suffered the former. Indignity indeed has seldom been added, they knew she was too dear to the nation to admit safely of such experiments upon her; so they gave her golden chains, and fed her, not with bread and water of affliction, but in king's palaces and at king's tables. However, anyhow, they hid her divine tokens, and in their stead they gave her some of their own special devising. For One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic, they have substituted “ National ” or “ by law established,” and with this spell they have thought, nay even still think to work for her those miracles which her divine gifts accomplished of yore. She is, it seems, in the judgment of the day, not “ the Catholic Church,” but the mere “ Church of England,” or “ the national religion,” or “ the religion of the majority; ” and hence it has sometimes happened, that even divines, who held the doctrine of the Apostolical succession, have deemed fit to hold it only in their closets, as true indeed but not an influential or practical truth,—a truth which little concerned the multitude, which had no charm in it, which the many could not under-

stand, which was no topic for the pulpit; in short, not as a "Note of the Church:" and in place of Catholic and Holy they have substituted "our venerable establishment," "part and parcel of the law of the land," "the National Church," "Protestantism," "the glorious memory," "Martin Luther," and "civil and religious liberty all over the world." In short, it has taken tavern toasts for the Notes of the Church.

Leaving, however, Mr. Palmer and the age to settle it between themselves concerning the respective influence of the old and the modern tokens of the Church's authority, we come to consider certain very serious objections which weigh against the reality of the former in this period of the world. It may, at first sight, be thought almost a truism, that the Church, in any sense in which a Protestant can accept it, has no Notes at all in this day, or in other words has ceased to exist; or, if we suppose that Notes can be found, and the ancient divinely framed Church ascertained, still that inasmuch as it cannot be shown to teach one and the same doctrine every where, whereas to learn the true faith was the very object of seeking for the Church, we are not at all better off after finding the Church than before. Granting that in each country there is a dominant Christian body, a body such that there can be no mistake as to its superior importance to the rest, and no question of its power of influencing men to join it from the fact of this superiority, still this dominant body teaches different doctrines in different countries; nay, is at variance with itself, excommunicating itself as found on its right hand or left. Either then there is no longer any Church remaining, or religious truth is of a variable nature, and it matters not what a man believes so that he conforms to the state of things under which he finds himself. In other words, to attempt in the present state of things to be a Catholic, is (it may be urged) to be in heart a latitudinarian and liberal; and the only escape from this conclusion is to take refuge in Romanism, which certainly does provide a Church one and the same in many places, as in form so in doctrine.

The most obvious and formidable view of the objection is, that the Church itself does not even *profess* to be one; not only differs, but has separated into parts, each of which almost denounces, certainly shuns, the rest. The Roman, Greek, and English, are its three great portions; and if the English does not reprobate the Roman and despise the Greek, at any rate the Greek and Roman denounce each other and agree, to say the least, in keeping aloof from the English. Of the three it is obvious that the Roman communion is the least open to the objection, because it is the widest spread and the best organized; it seems to be universal, yet one. Accordingly it seems able to dispense with both Greek and

Anglican branches, and in many instances has actually carried its own succession into their sees. The Greek Catholics have no pretensions at all to universality; but Anglo-Catholicism might have equalled Romanism in territory, if our Protestant governors had felt any sufficient zeal in its cause. Considering the colonies of England in all parts of the world, it is not easy to estimate what the strength of the English Church at this day might have been, had not ministers been too jealous, and commerce been too avaricious and democratical. However, she has hitherto most honorably refrained from imitation of the Roman Body, in disowning her sister Churches and identifying her communion with Catholicism. She has accepted their orders, and respected their territory; though, by the way, it is remarkable that at this very moment a grasping and domineering spirit is at work among us in some directions, very unlike that which we have hitherto cherished,—a spirit which would imitate one of the worst features of the Papacy in past centuries, and tends to interfere with Rome in France and with Constantinople in the Archipelago—which seems bent, after the precedent of Hildebrand, on reducing the whole of Christendom to the model of the reformed Prayer Book and the Thirty-nine Articles. But to return to Mr. Palmer; he, as might be expected, acknowledges both Greece and Rome in their respective places to be parts of the Church Catholic, though of course only part; but then comes the anxious question, which must be removed before we can safely settle ourselves in such a decision, viz. whether local bodies which have separated from each other can be part of the One Church; for if not, we shall be driven perforce either to deny that there is a Catholic Church, or to deny either the Roman Communion or our own to be part of it. Here, indeed, lies the common stratagem of Roman controversialists. They prove, what is plain enough, that there is one, and can be but one, Church; and then assuming that Rome and England cannot be part of one, they argue, that if one must be taken in preference to the other, surely the Roman Church, (allowing ever so much for its short-comings in point of universality,) is far nearer Catholic than the English. Mr. Palmer, however, denies the assumption on which this conclusion is based; and, heading a chapter with the question “Whether the external Communion of the Universal Church can ever be interrupted,” answers it in the affirmative.

This question, indeed, is one of the critical points of the controversy between us and Romanists; Mr. Palmer argues in defence of the English determination of it as follows:—He allows to the Romanist, that though different religious societies should agree together in fundamental doctrines, (whatever those doctrines are,)

yet if they are really excommunicated and anathematized by each other, they cannot be branches of one and the same Church Catholic; but he denies that breaches short of this extreme character are equally fatal to unity, or that those in the Roman, Greek, and English communions bear it. He argues that misunderstandings and quarrels were certain to arise in the Church in the course of years, and as it extended, which no means could settle but a centre of unity; that where bishops and churches were free and equal, there was no possible arbiter; that both parties, to a certain extent, would be right and both wrong, that in consequence they would be so circumstanced that either both ought to be reckoned as schismatical or neither,—both cut off from the Church or neither; and that while it is impossible to suppose both parties severed from the living vine without denying the present existence of the church, and allowing that the prophecies respecting her have failed, so it is more accordant to God's known mercies to suppose that he will bear with human infirmity both on the one side and the other. He grants, then, that acts of schism separate from the Church, but denies that estrangement, though a sin somewhere, necessarily involves a schism, as not being an act of rebellion against a constituted authority; and while Romanists argue *antecedently* in behalf of a centre of unity from the necessary occurrence of estrangements without it, Mr. Palmer argues, from the *fact* that there is no centre of unity, that such estrangements are not schisms. Again, unity cannot be more strictly a condition of the Christian Church than absence of idolatry of the Jewish; now the Jews did not cease to be God's people *ipso facto* on their idolatry, though they were punished for it; nor do Christian communities cease to be part of the Christian Church though they break communion, not denying heavy judgments may be the consequence. Mr. Palmer allows that the Fathers sometimes say strong things against the possibility of divisions in the Church Catholic, as when St. Cyprian says, "Unity cannot be severed, nor the one body by laceration be divided;" but he answers that they were not competent judges of a state of things not actually before their eyes. They used statements, which were not realized to their minds, except in that form in which we accept them as fully as the Romanists. The Novatians, for instance, in Cyprian's time, were establishing a *rival* communion to the Church in Rome and elsewhere. The point virtually in debate then was, whether *two* true Churches could be rivals in *one* place; but the question whether *two* Churches in *two* places could be in a state of *estrangement*, had never fairly been contemplated at that time, and the words of the Fathers are but words and not ideas, which seem to bear upon a

state of things not existing. Further, he argues from the fact that branches of the Church were anciently divided at times from each other, yet neither was considered *ipso facto* cut off from Christ. Thus

“Innocentius of Rome, with whom St. Augustine communicated, was himself not in communion with the eastern Churches.”—vol. i. p. 79.

“I need not dwell,” he proceeds, “on the excommunication of the Asiatic Churches by Victor and the Roman Church; nor on that of Cyprian and the Africans by Stephen, who, when some African bishops came to Rome, forbade the people to communicate with them, or even to receive them into their houses; nor on the excommunication of Hilary of Arles by Leo. In all these cases, different parts of one and the same Catholic Church were separated from external communion. But we may observe instances in which this division was carried to a greater extent, and involved the whole Church. Feury (himself of the Roman communion) says, with reference to the death of Chrysostom, ‘His death did not terminate the division of the Churches of the East and West; and while the Orientals refused to re-establish his memory, the Roman Church, followed by all the West, held firm to the resolution she had taken not to communicate with the oriental bishops, especially with Theophilus of Alexandria, until an ecclesiastical council should be held to remedy the evils of the Church.’—vol. i. p. 80.

He then proceeds to mention the division in the time of Acacius of Constantinople, when communion between East and West was suspended. This state of things lasted thirty-five years. And, next, he alludes to the great schism of the West, A. D. 1379—1414, when the Latin Church was divided into two or three obediences, subject to as many rival Popes, and in great degree estranged from mutual communion. But if division in the branches of the Church, where there is no rebellion against constituted authority, is not *ipso facto* formal schism, length of time cannot make it such. If thirty-five years do not deprive a secluded branch of its Catholicity, neither does a hundred. The best answer, as Mr. Palmer observes, that Roman controversialists have made to such historical facts, has been to maintain, that the estranged parties had right *motives*, and communicated all along with some *third party*. But it may be replied, if so, then that third party, and not the Pope, was the centre of unity. Again, Mr. Palmer disputes the matter of fact, there being no third party with whom East and West were in communion in the time of Acacius. Besides, he says, that such a circumstance is at best only an alleviation, and does not tend to destroy the fact that there is a breach of communion between the parties at variance. Moreover, he acutely remarks that, if good motives and the internal union kept up by *actual* communion with a third party,

are sufficient to retain all parties in a state of grace, then the same good motives, and the internal union resulting from *past* derivation from the universal Church, may do the same. And, further, he takes the definition of schism provided by Romanists themselves, and shows that it does not apply to the case under consideration. Schism is said to consist in "a separation from the communion of the Universal Church, which happens, *either* when the Church excludes any one from its body, *or* when any one leaves its communion." There is evidently a supposeable case, unprovided for by this definition, which is the very case in point; viz. that of the Church's being divided on some question, and each portion simply keeping to itself and discontinuing its intercourse with the other, yet without anathema. Lastly, he shows that Roman theologians allow what he contends for. "We do not pretend," says Nicole, "that the actual unity which consists in the *effective union* of all the Church is *essential* to the Church, because this union may be troubled by divisions and contests which God permits." He even lays down two conditions, on observance of which the parties at variance are not to be accounted schismatics,—that "all those who are divided in good faith by some controversy which is not ruled or decided, *tend sincerely to unity*;" and the second, that they must "acknowledge a common judge, to which they refer their differences, which is a *general council*." This is an abstract of Mr. Palmer's observations on this important point; and it affords a specimen of the pains and completeness with which his work is executed. And in the same careful way he goes into the Greek and English history, and shows that whatever unhappy quarrels exist, no formal excommunications are pending between them and Rome, or between each other. Nor is this mode of treating the subject any evasion of the real difficulty. If, indeed, the question were a moral one, there is no doubt that we are as far separated from Rome as any formal excommunication could make us. Our opinions, habits, and feelings, as a nation, have very little in common with the Roman Church and system. But it is a question of positive religion; the Church Catholic is a positive institution, and its essence, as being such, lies in formal observances; and the same mode of arguing which would infer that the Church had failed, because its portions are *virtually* in schism, would avail to prove that the registration of infants among certain Dissenters is baptism, because, though water is not used, a religious dedication is *intended*.

Now let us proceed to the other branch of the difficulty above mentioned, and observe how Mr. Palmer disposes of it. Granting that the Church has not committed suicide in the unnatural warfare of member against member, still the question remains,

whether the differences of doctrine within it are not themselves such,—whether Rome, Greece, and England, are not so far opposed in their notions as to what the Gospel is,—that either religious truth is of a variable nature, or it is an absurdity to call the Church of England practically one with the Church of Rome. 'This is what may be objected; and "what," it may be asked, "becomes of the Notes of the Church? what purpose do they serve? what relief and guidance is afforded to the inquiring mind, if the Church thus indicated preaches Popery in Rome, and Zwingli-Lutheranism in England?" The difficulty is certainly considerable; apparently insurmountable by those who hold that the Roman communion is the communion of Antichrist; for they either contract the Catholic Church into a few countries, with the Donatists of old; or, if they allow Rome to be part of the Church still, in spite of its teaching heresy, they seem to go against the prophecies which speak of the Church's Teachers never being removed, nor the Divine Word in her mouth failing.

Mr. Palmer does not seem to consider that the *formal* doctrine of the Roman Church is of so erroneous a nature as it is often considered, though of course he is quite alive to the pernicious characters of the existing Roman system viewed in action; nor, does he not pursue the mode which most of our divines have taken in rescuing her from the extreme sentence which Ultra-Protestants would pass upon her. It has been usual with them to contend, that, with all her errors, she "holds the foundation," as they express it, and therefore is to be accounted a branch of Christ's institution, though a corrupted branch. Accordingly, they have employed themselves in determining what the foundation is, or laying down those Fundamentals of faith which are sufficient for the being of a Church, in spite of the wood, hay, and stubble heaped upon them. Now the advantage of the view in the controversy is obvious. If it be once certain what the general range of doctrines is that which constitutes "the Faith," it is certain what are *not* those doctrines, that is, what are additions to it; and thus we are released from the witness of the existing Catholic body, and may throw ourselves on historical evidence, and are thereby provided not only with means for opposing such Churches as have added to it, but with a satisfaction while opposing them, from knowing that, while they hold the original deposit or foundation as well as their own additions, they enjoy the rights and privileges of the Christian Church. We may grant or maintain without inconvenience that those additions are great and serious; and, on the other hand, we may grant without embarrassment the existence of defects in our own system. However, Mr. Palmer thinks that Fundamentals of faith cannot be assigned, and consequently, since the Catholic Church is promised general

agreement and Freedom from error in some sense or other, and since he does not admit the existence of any Fundamentals to which these properties can be confined, he is led to consider that she does even at this day preach every where one and the same doctrine, and that, the true doctrine, except in very minor and secondary points, or except as popular errors interfere with it. This will appear from the following passages.

He observes, for instance, that "it is *very probable* that in reality she," the English Church, "agrees in *all* matters of faith with other Churches, for she admits the same rule,"—Catholic Tradition, vol. i. p. 226. Speaking of the Oriental Churches, he says, "It does not appear that they differ, in articles of faith, from the rest of the Church. The Roman Churches claim them as agreeing with *themselves* on almost every point; and if we may judge by their published sentiments, we should conclude that the Oriental Church, as a body, denies no article of faith which we *ourselves* maintain."—p. 182. As to the great Western Councils in the middle ages, "several of those objected to in no degree differ from our doctrine."—p. 230. "We account for the absence of communion between ourselves and other Churches *without imputing heresy, schism, or apostasy* to them or to ourselves."—p. 251, 252. Speaking of the Archbishop of Moscow's summary of Christian Divinity (1765), he says, "The doctrine of this work in all matters of faith and morality *appears generally unexceptionable*. It only differs from ours in defending certain practices which we have judged it more wise and pious to remove, and in the verbal dispute about the Procession," &c.—vol. i. p. 181. Again:—

"It is confessed that *some doctrinal errors*, and *some superstitious practices*, prevailed in them [the Western Churches] in latter ages; but it has been already observed, that the existence of some faults and imperfections by no means annuls the character of a Church; and, as in the present case, it arose from want of information and discussion, and besides no article of the faith appears to have been denied or corrupted by these Churches in general, there seems no reason whatever to dispute their Christianity."—p. 277.

Elsewhere he has the following very observable passage:—

"Our adversaries, however reluctantly, are obliged to bear witness to the general orthodoxy of our faith. The very points on which we are assailed by some Romanists, are relinquished by others. The points of difference are acknowledged to be but few, by some of their most noted and learned writers; and the Church of England is triumphantly cleared of heresy on every point by their confessions. Are we charged with Bossuet, with denying the authority of the Church, and rendering it subservient to the civil power? Milner replies to him, that the Church of England holds on these points the principles of the Catholic Church. Are we accused of denying the Real Presence? Milner and Hornyneld

acknowledge our perfect belief of that doctrine. I will not here dwell at length on these things ; it is sufficient to add, that the Articles of the Church of England have been approved in almost all points by Davenport and Du Pin ; and that various Romanists of note have held the difference between us to be so small, as to render a re-union of the Churches by no means impossible.”—vol. i. p. 231, 232.

He adds in a note the confession of “ Dr. Charles O’Conor, by far the most learned writer who has arisen among the Papists of these countries, in modern times ;” who says—

“ I am confident that above three parts of those debates which separate Protestants from Catholics might be laid aside ; that they serve only to exasperate and alienate us from each other ; and that if our Church were heard canonically, she would not only reject with horror the false doctrines and notorious abominations so often imputed to her, but she would also smooth many other difficulties which lie in the way of reconciliation and peace.”—*Columbanus*, Letter 3, p. 130.

Such, on the whole, is Mr. Palmer’s judgment of the state of Christendom generally. And, speaking in particular of the English and foreign Churches, he says—

“ Our communion is interrupted by accidental circumstances, misunderstandings, faults, &c. which do not, strictly speaking, involve either party in schism or heresy.”—vol. i. p. 237. “ It is true that their Church [the Roman] is in error on several points, and even perhaps in matters of faith, but it seems that they were prevented by so many excusable circumstances from seeing the right way, that we ought not to judge too harshly, and exclude from the Church of Christ so vast a multitude of believers, so many nations, and such a crowd of ancient Churches. * * * Nor is there evidence that any of their doctrines have been ever formally and clearly condemned by the Catholic Church. No one pretends that they have been so ; and the truth is, that many of their theologians so explain and teach the doctrines in dispute, that the difference, as represented by them, is in most points not considerable.”—p. 286-7. “ There is scarcely a point in debate between us, in which our doctrines might not be proved singly from Romish theologians. I have observed a thousand proofs of this.”—*Ibid.* “ The opinions and practices common to the Western Churches, which were objected to, were not contrary to faith, according to the opinion of the Reformation, evidenced by the Confession of Augsburgh.”—vol. ii. p. 130.

And of the character of the differences between parties in our own Church at the time of the Reformation he speaks as follows :

“ We deny that any new important truth unknown for ages to the Catholic Church, or never heard of before, was promulgated at this time [of the Reformation] in the Church of England. We by no means admit that the royal supremacy then acknowledged by the Church of England was novel. We suppose that some superstitious opinions, commonly received by abuse in some Churches, e. g. the Papal Infallibility and Universal Jurisdiction, Purgatory, Transubstantiation, were

suppressed ; some doctrines were defined more accurately which had been vaguely and imperfectly held ; the Scriptures were more freely circulated ; several superfluous and absurd rites were removed and others were corrected. There was nothing in all this which required any extraordinary mission or superlative sanctity. It may be objected that this affords an inadequate view of the important changes made by the Reformation, and that if the difference between the faith of the Church of England before and after it, was not profound and total, it could never have been worth while to suffer martyrdom for the truths of the Reformation, or to separate from the existing Church. But I reply that this proceeds on a totally erroneous view of facts. Those who suffered under Queen Mary suffered because they would not profess their belief in certain mistaken opinions, which their opponents erroneously asserted to be matters of faith ; and therefore the fact of their suffering does not prove that there was in reality a total contradiction in matters of faith between them and their persecutors. The Lutherans always, as we know, asserted that they did not differ in any article of faith from the Catholic or even the Roman Church, but only as to certain abuses and erroneous opinions."—vol. i. p. 429.

Thus Mr. Palmer seems to hold that the existing Church in every age, in spite of and allowing for the clouds of popular or scholastic error which are upon her, though not of her, is the sufficient teacher of her children ; and being an ordinance of God so visible, so distinctly marked, so incommunicable in her attributes, can always be found by those who seek for her.

Now we doubt not that many persons fresh from the study of Burnet and Tomline will be moved by some of the above statements, whom we request to respect the liberty of the English Protestant. The Revolution did not change Articles or Liturgy, though it brought in another mode of thinking ; what divines said before it they may, if they please, say now. We do not indeed concur, as far as we are able to form an opinion, in the particular theory which seems to have led Mr. Palmer to the statements above quoted, but we do vindicate for him in this matter, and for any one who will, a freedom of judgment which our Church has never taken from us, and which many of our most revered divines have exercised. For instance, Hammond, as quoted by Mr. Palmer, makes a suggestion, which, if breathed now, would in some quarters create a panic or rouse a persecution.

"As we exclude no Christian," he says, "from our communion that will either filially or fraternally embrace it with us, being ready to admit any to our assemblies that acknowledge the foundation laid by Christ and his Apostles ; *so we as earnestly desire to be admitted to the like freedom of external communion with all the members of all other Christian Churches, and would most willingly, by the use of the ancient method of Litteræ Communicatoriæ, maintain this communion with those with*

whom we cannot corporally assemble, and *particularly with those who live in obedience to the Church of Rome.*"—Of Schism, ch. ix. sec. 3.

Mr. Palmer then has a full right, if he thinks fit, to hold the doctrine which is contained in the foregoing passages of his work; and that, whether the arguments for its truth which approve themselves to him are satisfactory to others or not. We shall not here attempt to call them in question; all we profess to do is to draw attention to the state of the case, and show to what his doctrine leads and what it accomplishes.

The received notion in the English schools seems to be, as has already been observed, that the faith which the Apostles delivered, has ever existed in the Church whole and entire, ever recognized as the faith, ascertainable as such, and separable (to speak generally) from the mass of opinions which with it have obtained among Christians. It is considered definite in its outline, though its details admit of more or less perfection; and in consequence it is the property of each individual, so that he may battle for it in his day, whoever attacks it: nay, as not receiving it simply from the existing Church, but through other sources besides, historical and scriptural, he may defend it, if needs be, against the Church, should the Church depart from it; the faith being the foundation of the Church as well as of the individual, and the individual being bound to obey the Church only so far as the Church holds to it. This is the doctrine of Fundamentals, and its peculiarity is this; that it supposes the Truth to be entirely objective and detached, not lying hid in the bosom of the Church as if one with her, clinging to and (as it were) lost in her embrace, but as being sole and unapproachable as on the Cross or at the Resurrection, with the Church close by but in the back ground. Now what the advantages of this doctrine are, will be seen by observing the disadvantages of the opposite, which Mr. Palmer adopts; but at the same time it is confessedly a less simple and a more difficult doctrine than his. The chief difficulty obviously is to determine what is the fundamental faith. A number of our most considerable divines have said that it is the Creed; but others take a different view of it. Waterland enumerates no less than eight distinct opinions, besides his own. Mr. Palmer urges this objection with great force, insisting upon the apparent absurdity of laying down, as if to settle controversies, what is more difficult to settle than any thing else, and raises more disputes than it even professes to extinguish. In this opinion he agrees with a writer, who has attracted some notice of late, and whose thoughts are not the less deep because they happen to be ardent. "Your trumpet principle," observes Mr. Froude, in a letter to a friend, "about Scripture being the sole rule of faith in *fundamentals* (I

nauseate the word), is but a mutilated edition" of the Protestant principle of the Bible and the Bible only, &c. "without the breadth and axiomatic character of the original."—Remains, vol. i. p. 415. It is not the habit of Mr. Palmer's mind to speak thus absolutely, and he is writing a formal treatise, yet the following sentences contain as decisive an *opinion* on the subject, if less frankly expressed. "As an ambiguous term, as conveying no one definite notion, it seems unqualified to be of any practical utility in questions of controversy."—vol. i. p. 122. "It can only cause confusion and perplexity, while it affords the most perfect facility to sophistical reasoners to escape from cogent arguments by changing imperceptibly the sense of the propositions."—p. 127. Thus argues our author; yet surely it is unfair to represent the question as one about the use of a *word*. With whatever variations it has been used, yet in the mouths of opponents of Romanism it denotes an idea as well; viz, the idea of a doctrine fully distinguished from other religious opinions, and already disengaged from its witnesses, and once for all recorded, whether this was done in the Apostles or in the primitive ages; and, as being such, it is opposed to the Roman theory of the faith, as being even down to this hour partially latent in the Church, and capable of growing into new definitions and being developed into new members any day. It is indeed as fair to urge the difficulty of determining *what* the Fundamentals of Faith are, as on the other hand, to urge that of determining *what* the Church's formal decision is, whether in the pope or in general council, or, in the Church diffusion; but it might as truly be said, that the Church's "judgment" was an ambiguous word, because divines differed in what it consists, as to ridicule the question of Fundamentals as a verbal dispute because Protestants differ one with another what to call fundamental.

We have already said, it is not our intention here to enter into the question itself; but it should be clearly understood that it is no trifling point which is in debate; that, whereas its decision this way or that is very important, so again it is one of considerable difficulty. It appears to us very plain that the primitive Church held the existence of a fundamental faith, and very hard to determine what that faith was. Again, the theory that the Church is absolutely our informant in divine truth, is most simple and unembarrassed, but then, this being taken for granted, we fight to disadvantage against the Romanists; for unless we can appeal to the past how can we condemn the present? and how can we detect additions unless we know what it is which is added to? Accordingly, Mr. Palmer seems to be led on to hold, that the faith of the Church *admits* of addition; again, that there is no test of

apostolic doctrine beyond universal consent, or that any doctrine which has once been generally received must be apostolic, or, in other words, that the majority cannot be wrong. For instance, in answer to the objection of Romanists against the Greeks, that the latter have not received the definitions of faith concerning papal primacy, purgatory, &c. made in the Councils of Lyons, Florence and others, he does not contend that such subjects are not part of the faith once delivered, and therefore the denial of them cannot be heresy, but “the Western Churches, at the time of such definitions, were not evidently *greater* and more numerous than the Eastern, and therefore their acceptance of the above synods was not a sufficient proof of the approbation of the *majority* of the Catholic Church.”—vol. i. p. 203. He adds, “This position is of so much importance that it deserves a more particular notice.” And after analysing the state of East and West in this respect, and comparing the number of dioceses in each at various times, with the respective losses of the former from the Saracens and the Nestorian and Eutychian heresies, and of the latter in Africa, and again the gains of the former in Russia, and of the latter in Germany, Denmark, &c. he concludes :

“There is therefore no probability that the Eastern Church in the middle of the 11th century, and even long afterwards, fell short of the Western, either in the number of its bishops, the extent of its jurisdiction, or the number and variety of the nations it embraced. It is impossible to determine precisely the number of bishops on each side; but there is neither proof nor presumption that the *majority* of the Church took part with the Roman Pontiff against the Greeks; and it is impossible to affirm with any certainty that the Western Churches were greater than the Eastern, up to the period of the Reformation.”

Accordingly he takes one by one the Councils of the Middle Ages, and shows that they were not really ecumenical, or their decrees consequently binding on our faith. Whether or not we think this necessary (for some will think that the mere fact that they went beyond the creed or fundamental faith, is a sufficient disproof of their Catholicity), at any rate it is interesting to see the argument worked out historically, and this Mr. Palmer has done in a very masterly way. We are tempted to extract his remarks on the Fourth Lateran, which is commonly considered to have established the doctrine of Transubstantiation.

“This synod consisting only of Latin bishops, and having never been received by the Oriental Churches, cannot be considered as invested with the authority of the Catholic Church. It was not acknowledged as ecumenical by the first edition of the Synod of Florence, nor in the license of Pope Clement VII. for publishing that synod, nor by Cardinal Contarenus, nor by the historians Platina, Nauclerus, Trithemius, or Albertus

Stadensis. The general doctrine of the decree on faith was directed against heretics who denied all that was most sacred in Christianity. But this decree has not the authority which might have been expected, because it appears not to have been made *conciliariter*, with synodical deliberation, discussion, and giving of suffrages ; but Innocentius caused it to be read with many others in the presence of the synod, and the bishops seem to have remained silent.

“ This objection alone would render the authority of such decrees very dubious, according to Bellarmine, Bossuet, Delahogue, &c., for the promises of Christ to aid his Church in determining the truth always suppose the use of ordinary means. These decrees were indeed known in the Western Church afterwards, rather under the name of Pope Innocentius, than of the Lateran synod. Hence, even if we admitted that it was the intention of this synod to define the modern Roman opinion of Transubstantiation as ‘ *de fide*,’ it would not follow that its definition was binding on the Church ; but there are very reasonable grounds for doubting that the synod had such an intention. The Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation supposes the *whole substance* (in the Aristotelic sense, as distinguished from the *accidents*) of bread and wine to cease, by conversion into a different substance ; so that the eucharist cannot be called bread after consecration, except in some figurative or tropical sense Though the term ‘ Transubstantiation,’ as Bossuet observes, naturally implies ‘ *a change of substance*,’ this by no means settles the question ; for it does not determine whether ‘ substance’ is used in the Aristotelic or the popular sense ; whether the change is physical, and in itself corresponding to other changes whether natural or miraculous, or entirely sacramental, spiritual, and ineffable ; in fine, whether it be partial or total. Hence those who employed the *term* Transubstantiation with reference to the mystical change, might quite consistently hold that the substance of bread was not physically changed, or that it did not cease to exist, or that it was changed by union with the substance of Christ’s body, or with His soul, or with the divine nature. All these opinions are consistent with the use of the term Transubstantiation, and all are contradictory to the common Roman doctrine on the subject.

“ In fact Pope Innocentius himself, in one of his books, having asserted that ‘ the matter of bread and wine is *transubstantiated* into Christ’s body,’ continues thus : ‘ but whether *parts* change into *parts*, or the *whole* into the *whole*, or the *entire* into the *entire*, He alone knows who effects it. As for me, I commit to the fire what remains ; for we are commanded to believe ; forbidden to discuss.’ Thus Innocentius declares that the total change of the substance is not a matter of faith ; and he mentions, *without any condemnation*, the opinion of some who held that the bread and wine remain after consecration together with the body and blood. He reserves the charge of heresy for those who held the bread to be only a figure of Christ’s body. This renders it very probable, that Innocentius in the synod of Lateran did not intend to establish any thing except the doctrine of the real presence. In fact the question was not then with those who denied the modern doctrine of Transubstantiation : it was with the Manichæans, who denied the real

presence of Christ's body in the eucharist. Nor was the term Transubstantiation introduced specially into the decree to meet any particular heresy, as the term 'consubstantial' had been introduced into the creed at the synod of Nice expressly to exclude the heresy of Arius. No one objected to this *term* at the Council of Lateran: no one had objected to it before; nor does it appear that it was disapproved of by any one till centuries afterwards, when it had been abused by some persons. Hence I conclude that the term was employed, not with any intention of establishing a specific view of the real presence; but simply as equivalent to 'conversion,' 'transformation,' 'change,' &c. which had been employed before, and continued to be employed afterwards to express the same thing.

"That this was so, and that the whole Western Church believed the common opinion of Transubstantiation not to be a matter of faith, may be inferred absolutely and conclusively from the fact, that while this opinion was held by the majority of scholastic theologians till the period of the Reformation, several other opinions, entirely inconsistent with it, were openly held and taught by writers of eminence, *without any condemnation or censure*. Durandus a S. Porciano, about 1320, taught that the matter of bread and wine *remain* after consecration. Nevertheless he was so far from being censured, that the pope made him bishop of Annecy, and afterwards of Meaux; and he is praised by Trithemius and Gerson, the latter of whom recommended his writings to students in the University of Paris. Cardinal d'Ailly, who presided at the Council of Constance, A.D. 1415, says, that 'although Catholics agree that the body of Christ is in the sacrament, there are different opinions as to the *mode*. The first is, that the *substance of bread is Christ's body*; the second, that the substance does not remain, but is reduced into matter existing by itself or receiving another form, &c.; the third, that the substance of bread remains; the fourth, and more common, that the substance does not remain, but simply ceases to exist.' Thus we see that the common opinion of Transubstantiation was only an '*opinion*,' and that different opinions were held by 'Catholics.' In fine, the scholastic theologians generally mention the different opinions, without imputing heresy to those that receive them."—vol. ii. p. 219—225.

Our limits will not allow us to say more on the subject of Mr. Palmer's book, or we are tempted to set before the reader other specimens of its most instructive contents. It must not be supposed because we have been led to discuss the main principle of his treatise, that the work is mainly engaged in laying down principles, and is of an abstract or merely rudimental character. This indeed would be misrepresenting one of the most various, comprehensive, and elaborate works which the present day has produced. But the discussions it contains would at best be but defectively exhibited in a Review, whereas it was both practicable and might be useful to describe the basis on which the treatise rests. For till we get a clear view of the elementary principles of Anglo-

catholicism, not merely of its general character, in which Mr. Palmer has no difference with other Anglican divines, we cannot hope to make a satisfactory fight against the enemies which surround us. Our author's theory of the revealed system issues in the same opinions and doctrines as that of other English divines; the only question is, what is the elementary formula or key, to which the phenomena of the system may best be referred.

ART. V.—*Truths and Fictions of the Middle Ages. The Merchant and Friar.* By Sir Francis Palgrave, K. H. London: Parker, West Strand. 1837.

No ONE can fail to be pleased with this book, who is at all a lover of antiquity, and has any wish for information respecting the times of our ancestors,—information that he can depend upon. It contains a great store of interesting facts, to use the common expression, relating to those times, which have also the additional recommendation of being true. This is an important feature in the book, and deserves notice. Sir Francis is often humorous, often philosophical, but he never speaks off the book, though superficial readers might be deceived at first by his manner. His most lively sallies are certain to be based on Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, &c. in the Record Office, or other documents of equal infallibility. And any one, who presuming on the free and imaginative form in which the author brings out his information, should choose to challenge the solidity of it, would shortly, we have no doubt, find himself dragged through black letter dormitories, and sepulchral repositories of all kinds; or perhaps treated as the bear was by the Aristotelian student, compelled to swallow some venerable parchment, a treasure in its way, but not of the palatable sort. We have great respect for a writer who always keeps in this way within hail of his facts; especially if, like Sir Francis, he can manage to be authentic and amusing at the same time. It is well known that a contrary habit has prevailed among our historians for some time past, especially those who have treated on this subject—the middle ages. A few selected facts have done for all of them, one after the other, as one of the wittiest writers of the day has most entertainingly shown us in one or two remarkable instances. First, Mosheim produces a statement from some original source; isolated perhaps, but still professing to be an original statement. This being done, it is done once and for all, they think. They go on swimmingly after it, and would go on to all eternity,

“ Labitur et labetur in omne volubilis ævum,

if there was no one, like the writer we referred to, to call them to account.

Robertson, Jortin, White, all receive what Mosheim has given them, and hand it over, more or less accommodated to their own views. They show no inclination to enlarge their number of facts; this would be contrary to their idea of philosophical history. No, they are quite satisfied, if they can refer to a note somewhere or other, which refers them back somewhere else; from whence they would be directed to some other source, how far from or near the original truth itself they neither know nor care. Meantime, in proportion to their ignorance of facts, is their precipitate and unscrupulous use of the few they have. They are merciless in their application of them. One positively is not safe in one's chair from the inferences they are ready to raise on the most paltry and minute premise imaginable.

“ The smutty grain
With sudden blaze diffused inflames the air.”

A single fact, under their judicious management, will blow up and change the aspect of a whole world, ancient or modern, as the case may be; or at any rate play tremendous work with several centuries, with which it had no sort of connexion to begin with. This is what we may call the historical lever. It shows what we can effect by the power of machinery, when applied to the manufacture of history; for history, it seems, is to be manufactured in this way, as well as articles of a grosser and more material character. Archimedes wished only for some ground to work from, and he would undertake to move the world with his lever. Two or three well-chosen facts supply this desirable ground to our modern historians. They do not desire more. Give them only these, and with their inferential lever they will produce the most astonishing results. They will prove at once, without further ceremony, a whole series of ages to have been all dark, or all enlightened, as they may wish to make out; that all was dark up to a certain time; that then a sudden move took place, a spring was touched, and we became perfectly civilized and enlightened as we should be. In this way the whole history of mankind is speedily disposed of. All from the creation of the world downwards is arranged into three or four grand æras, which succeed each other very conveniently, and all entirely of one character or entirely of another, which makes them easy to remember. The world is either dark or it is enlightened, one of the two, as Pyramus tells us,—

“ O grim looked night, O night with hue so black,
O night which ever art when day is not.”

If the age is not enlightened, then it is dark ; if it is not dark, why then it is enlightened. At this rate we get over the ground quick ; in a hop, skip, and jump, we are brought from primeval chaos down to the nineteenth century, and Mr. Pinnock's catechism, which compresses all history whatever into a thin duodecimo, turns out to be no unfair or inadequate abridgment.

Now Sir Francis Palgrave is not an historian of this calibre, nor, if we estimate rightly, has he any ambition to follow in such a wake. He is content rather with taking a limited field of inquiry, and superintending it properly, and is better pleased with a quiet walk about his own grounds, with the "*latis otia fundis*," as Virgil has it ; so that he is able to observe how matters stand, and note down objects as he goes along. He is better pleased with this safe and steady mode of proceeding, than if he were bestriding hill and dale in seven-leagued boots, or playing at leap-frog over the patriarchal heads of eras, epochs, and centuries, from the back of the sixth, seventh, or eighth century, as it may happen, to the shoulders of the sixteenth, and never fairly using his legs, or acknowledging terra firma, till he finds himself side by side with his friend and contemporary the nineteenth itself. The author of the *Merchant and Friar* likes to feel himself on solid ground, though he takes things leisurely, and is satisfied with bringing out facts here and there, not on any set theory, but only to illustrate, in an intelligible way, the manners, mode of thinking, state of knowledge, law, government, and society in the age that he treats of. Not that he is solely, however, and exclusively a matter-of-fact writer. He is a philosopher when he chooses it, though he does not take a scientific view of history ; and we hope, before the end of this article, to make use of some of his reflections, which are certainly of a deep and forcible character, and would serve to improve any one's views who really entered into them. But at present we will draw the reader's attention to some of his *Truths and Fictions of the middle ages*, premising, however, with what we have said, that his fiction is as solid as his truth, and may be as much depended on. And while we turn Sir Francis to good account in this way, we shall also string together a few remarks of our own, which, we hope, will accord with what we shall extract from the work. Not that we have any particular theory to advance on the subject of the middle ages ; only a book like the present naturally leads one's thoughts in that direction, and perhaps gives them a bias, not in favour of former ages, to the prejudice of our own, but certainly against that extremely contemptuous mode of treating them, which we have partly alluded to, and which puts them all under one thick

blot of ignorance and superstition without discrimination or set off of any kind.

The plan of the Merchant and Friar is soon explained. The Merchant is Marco Polo, who has found his way into England on some trading speculation: the Friar is no other than the celebrated Roger Bacon. They fall in with each other in the hall of the abbey at Abingdon: where the former, according to the custom of the times, is entertained by the abbot and his brethren; though it seems there was an inn or hostelry in the place even in those days. But Marco and his party were travellers, and "travellers from Cathay:" a circumstance of interest, which procured them an invitation to the abbey. There Marco sees the Friar; they are both intellectual persons, though in different ways, and each hopes to gain something from the other. The result of which is, that the latter accompanies Marco to London, where he takes him to the different places and institutions which were worth seeing in those days.

In the abbey hall the conversation naturally turns on foreign countries, foreigners, and wonderful phenomena of different kinds; and Sir Francis evidently, from the turn of it, gives up the Middle Ages in point of science. However, even in those days, it appears, there were scientific circles existing every here and there; not equal in extent or system to our British associations, but still sufficient to hand down the torch to posterity. Nay, there was even publishing and pamphleteering going on, on a small scale, however impossible it may appear; and Marco Polo in consequence, who is a person of general information, finds himself equal to a scientific conversation with Bacon, though science is not his peculiar fort.

"Circumstances had enabled him to form some reasonable conjectures respecting the applications of the powers of nature indicated by the Friar; and the subject was not entirely new to him. Friar Bacon had, some time before, inscribed an epistle to Brother William of Paris, bearing the title '*De secretis Operibus Artis et Naturæ, et de Nullitate Magiæ*,' in the fourth chapter whereof all these prospective discoveries are enumerated.

"This epistle, like many others upon similar subjects, which the Friar had addressed to Pope Clement, and to other distinguished personages, belonged to that extensive genus which, in our times, has been designated as correspondence for the press, and not for the post. Neither press nor post then existed. But, nevertheless, the coy reserve which shrinks from the sight in order to be more surely drawn forth into the universal gaze, obtained the degree of tenderness which such sensitive shyness required. Modesty is not always rendered indignant by gentle violence; and it was as well understood then, as it could possibly be now, that the discreet friend who received the full answers to questions which had never been

asked,—the satisfactory explanations of matters about which he had never inquired,—the clear solution of doubts which he had never raised,—and the affectionate explanations for the relief of his non-existent anxiety,—would ill requite the kindness of his correspondent, unless he took effectual means for preventing the world at large from being deprived of the ‘private and confidential communication’ with which he had thus been favoured.

“Brother William, therefore, did not scruple to show the epistle of the English philosopher to all the curious who wished to inspect it; and—as collectors are wont to do—even to many who did not. Nor did he ever refuse the loan thereof to the transcribers by trade, first exacting, it is true, a solemn promise that the document should be treated with as much precaution as it was imparted. So that we need not wonder that a copy had very speedily—within nine years from the day of its date—reached Venice, and that Marco was fully aware of the doctrines which the Friar held.”—pp. 45—47.

So much for the science of the middle ages. We are not, however, going to be paradoxical, or to make out a case for them on that head. We confess that they were ignorant of the powers of nature, and that their astronomical theories will not bear examination. But this we will be bold enough to say, that we could never understand on what authority the present age sets up the advancement of science as the great, the only standard in short, of civilization. We know that we are treading on difficult ground here; and that it is no easy matter to define so complicated a thing as civilization: but we have a strong notion nevertheless, amounting to conviction, that the definition of it is not, after all, so immediately based on mathematics or physics. Without attempting to depreciate them, we must be allowed to think that there may be cultivation of mind without them, unless we set down the whole ancient world as uncivilized; Athens in the age of Pericles, and Rome in the Augustan age of literature, as uncivilized. There can be no doubt that journeys were more troublesome, and the post less regular, and machinery less ingeniously conducted in those days than in our own. Yet we allow the ancients to have had a touch of cultivation about them. We do not put Augustus Cæsar and the king of the Sandwich Islands on a level, either as regards their persons or their subjects. Nay, we may come nearer home than the ancients on a subject like this. If a person has cultivated tastes, a perception of the beautiful, imagination, poetry more or less developed; we should be sorry, if we are obliged to think him a barbarian, because his information was limited respecting the powers of nature, and many important phenomena in our material system. Some of our most intimate friends lie under this intellectual stigma. Highly as we esteem their tone of mind in many respects, it is doing them no injustice

to think that they might have lived from the earliest ages down to the present, without enlightening the world with one scientific observation, or furnishing a single implement for the subjugation of the elements. Come, gentle reader, let us recollect ourselves, and look around us a little; for we are not inclined to betray either ourselves or our friends, without pulling others into the same scrape. We hope we shall not be thought ill-natured, or we should not perhaps divulge our suspicions so freely; but we cannot help suspecting that there is more deficiency even in the nineteenth century, in this department of knowledge, than many of us are aware of. Could we but take a look into the interior of persons' minds, it is to be feared we should, in more than a few instances, meet with highly lax and disorderly notions on the subject of the solar system, and others of the like stamp. Ask that gentleman of great talents and promise, who has been entertaining a party for the last half-hour with a flow of elegant information, seasoned with recondite and extended views on various points; introduce to his consideration, what shall we say? some unlucky topic involving the terms, axis, pole, hemisphere, &c. and we doubt not that he will parry your interrogatories with admirable skill and coolness; but we more than doubt whether he will *answer* them; answer them fairly and manfully as he ought to do, and as he would be required to do in Joyce's Catechism of the Arts and Sciences. His replies, if we mistake not, will be rather of the judiciously evasive cast, nicely doubting the point in question; protecting the reputation of the speaker, but highly unsatisfying to the inquirer. Such is the poor use we have made of our advantages, and accumulated instructions. We must make the confession our own. Conversation is apt to fall at times, even in the best informed circles, on the introduction of certain momentous subjects we have alluded to; and to fall with a degree of precipitation too, not at all indicative of the supremacy of science in the minds of many of us. Yet we do not uncivilize the simply ornamental, or imaginative, or rhetorical, or contemplative powers among our contemporaries in consequence. We do not mention Sir Walter Scott, for example, as a barbaric genius, and class him with the ancient Druids; though, if the truth be stated, his tone of mind had as little of sympathy in it for the cause of the British Association, as any among the venerable order we have mentioned, could one of them be made to re-appear. It may be said, perhaps, that we cannot judge of things so: that the nineteenth century throws a halo around all who lie under its light, even when the individual is most removed in character from it; that the age civilizes him, though, as far as his personal choice was concerned, he would have remained perhaps an obstinate barbarian to the

end of his days. This of course is easily said. Yet we think that the accession of dignity, which Scott, Southey, and Wordsworth gain from their connexion with the present age, and which they enjoy in common with all the rest of her majesty's subjects, is at any rate small, and hardly distinguishable.

We allow then the attributes of civilization to attach sometimes to unworthy objects; to those who go against rather than aid the spirit of the age; to a large class of respectable characters, whom we need not enumerate, who have only a limited acquaintance with what is called *par excellence knowledge*; yet with or without it continue to execute their appointed duties, whether as fathers of families, magistrates, or holding other common though important positions. True it is, we pity a person who thus

“ Benighted walks under the midday sun,
Himself is his own dungeon,”

but we go no further. And why cannot we take the same indulgent view of the middle ages? allow them, that is, their share of civilization, though taking into account their darkness on the particular subject of knowledge or science? We have often tried to speculate for curiosity's sake on the probable view which Bacon, and others like him, who rose above the philosophy of their age, took of the state of the world around them. Superior knowledge, we know on good authority, does not incline men to humility. Still, we should not be surprised to find that those persons, great as were their attainments, were far from taking the same low view of their own times that we do, who of course know so much less about them. And perhaps the most probable conjecture after all is, that they communicated pretty much on terms of equality with their contemporaries; conscious of course of their superior talents, just as clever men now are; but not at all aware that they were living in the “*dark ages*.” Sir F. Palgrave's Merchant and Friar do not turn up their noses at all existing institutions, though they are both men of most enlightened minds, quite the reverse; and we imagine Sir Francis is right in his portraiture. The Friar, indeed, has odd ways and lives in a tower by himself. But philosophers are apt to be eccentric at all times. We will venture to say, that in spite of the Friar's fondness for retirement, he did not entertain ultra-liberal views, or think his own age *antiquated*. We will give however part of a conversation which touches on the subject, and to which Sir Francis appends some remarks of his own.

“‘ I love my own republican city,’—replied Marco,—‘ but as to birds, there is none so bad as that which befouls its own nest. If you had travelled far and wide, as I have done, you would not have thought

yourself compelled to draw the conclusion at which you have arrived. Institutions, wise on the banks of the Arno, may be sheer folly here, upon the borders of the Thames.'

" ' You must have seen,'—said the Friar, interrupting the conversation, as he was wont to do,—' a great variety of head-dresses in your travels, Messer Marco ?'

" ' Sure have I.'—replied Marco gesticulating and counting, according to Italian fashion, upon the thumb and fingers of his left hand as he spoke: thumb, ' turbans at Damascus,'—fore finger, ' sheepskin kal-packs at Balkh,'—middle finger, ' red berrets at Fez,'—ring finger, ' scarlet hats at Rome,'—little finger,—' buttoned caps at Cambalu,'—thumb again—' broad-brimmed chapeaux at Paris,'—fore finger again,—' hoods here in London,'—middle finger again,—' coifs for the Court,'—ring finger again,—' cowls for the cloister,'—little finger again,—' helmets for the field, and many many more,—every possible variety.'

" ' But, inasmuch,'—resumed Bacon,—' as all men's heads are round on the outside, even so are all coverings, which fit the same heads, round within, however different they may be in external shape, stuff or colour. If you are sufficiently protected against sleet and snow in the mountains, and defended from the sun in the plains, I do not suppose that you, as an experienced traveller, would censure the fashion which that portion of your attire assumes.'

" ' Certainly not,'—replied Marco :—' I neglect the guise, if comfort and protection be attained.' "—pp. 207—209.

" Marco Polo, in his age of darkness, was more consistently philosophical than we are, in this our era of epidemic innovation,—the age in which Judges shed their wigs, and Turks shave their beards. Let us compare the opinion of Marco Polo, with the amusing work of a recent traveller. ' No people,'—says he,—' can be more thoroughly *enslaved* than the Uzbecks, there is no shadow of popular government: but still,'—continues the Lieutenant, with honest surprise,—' there is no evidence of popular discontent,'—a phenomenon which appears to him thoroughly unaccountable. Popular contentment without popular government! Happiness without brawlers in the Town Hall, and bawlers in the Senate! Is not this as strange as nourishment without food, or light without the sun?—How do they manage matters amongst the Uzbecks? What recipe keeps this singular people in a state of tranquil contentment?—Is it to be attributed to the Bang which they smoke, or the bangs which they receive?

" Both these sedatives may help: both are capital in their way; but how is Bokhara governed—let us read the Traveller's own words. ' The Koran is the base of the government. The Khan, who is unremitting in business, attends daily at the Court-house, with the Cadi and the Mollahs, to decide every cause, according to law.—The Koran, their guide, may not be the best standard of legislative excellence, but this sort of decision is exceedingly popular, and relieves them from the *jus vagum aut incognitum* of a despot. They are protected by the strict enforcement of its law, and it leads the people to consider their clergy as their best defenders against the abuse of the ruling powers.' And

thus does a man of no ordinary intelligence, entirely confound form and substance: and actually lose all perception of the truths which he so lucidly unfolds.—Because he cannot find the precise form which we in Great Britain consider as the machinery of a popular government, he denies the name to institutions, cherished and supported by the people, deriving their whole strength from the consent and approbation of the people,—and effectually protecting the people against every abuse of power, and against every act, which, according to their notions and views, would be oppression or tyranny.

“Not that it is desirable to adopt the Uzbek Constitution in the United Kingdom. I delight in the excellence of the Uzbek policy,—I bend before the Mollahs and honour the Cadi,—yet, dear countrymen,—do not catch any enthusiasm for the Uzbeks,—do not try to imitate them. do not attempt to purchase tranquillity by such superstition, do not reform too much,—let us let well alone. As inexpedient would be the introduction of such a Moslem Government amongst us, as it would be to ask you and me to sit cross-legged on the carpet, scoop out our pudding in our palms, and tear our roast beef with our fingers.

“Neither would I advise the dear Uzbeks to copy from us. Let them let well alone.—Place Ibrahim in an English attitude at a dinner-table: he sits upon thorns, and, when he attempts to feed himself, his fingers instinctively ascend to his mouth, whilst the morsel at the end of the fork travels upwards to his eye. Whilst the Koran is the rule of faith in Bokhara, the Khan, the Mollahs, and the Cadi, will do quite as well for the Uzbeks, as the House of Commons and the Union Workhouse for the United Kingdom.”—pp. 211—214.

But we turn now to a graver part of our subject, though a part intimately connected with that low state of knowledge which we have been speaking of, we mean the superstition of the middle ages. The middle ages were superstitious, every one says. Yes. They certainly were. We are right in thinking so. And yet they were not wholly sunk or enveloped in superstition. The unthinking and unstable portion of society, which perhaps was the larger half, gave way to bad influences. But there was also a counteracting power on the other side, which preserved in some measure the religious balance, and prevented the age from falling. There seems to have been throughout those times a superior class, who were no friends to superstition. The Church, for we must come to her at last, was no friend to superstition; and the ruling powers, acting doubtless on her suggestions, interposed with law and penalty to discontinue it. In this way Sir F. Palgrave describes the working of the spirit of the age; one part of society under its influence, another above it.

“‘It is singular,’ said Marco Polo, ‘to observe how identical these superstitious practices and opinions are in all parts of the world. In the recesses of Hindostan, you find the same scheme of planetary influences as our astrologers adopt, and the same class of spells employed for ob-

taining a fallacious prospect of futurity, as are in vogue, in spite of all the denunciations of our Prelates, in every country of western Christendom. The dark-eyed daughters of Java endeavour to reclaim an unfaithful lover by the same arts as the Grecian Amaryllis. And the tales repeated around the hearth of the Italian peasant may be heard on the banks of the Ganges.'

“ ‘ Rather say,—it is not singular,’—replied the Friar, ‘ that these superstitious practices and opinions should be identical in all parts of the world, since they all spring from the same common cause—Man rebelling against the will of his Creator, striving to obtain that knowledge which has been withheld from us by mercy : yielding to sinful lusts and wishes : and seeking aid and comfort in any source rather than in submission to the divine will. The spirit of this idolatry is universal. But the special form which it takes in the case of the jealous, afflicted, or forsaken damsel, who has just taken flight, is derived from the heathenism of her Anglo-Saxon ancestors. It cometh even within the letter of the fifth chapter of the law which Canute the Dane established by the Council of the Witan, the wise men of England, and which wholly prohibits the fantastic ceremonies performed in the worship of the greenwood tree, the rock, the flood-water, or the spring.’ ”—pp. 54, 55.

What we complain of is, that people will not condescend to use discrimination in their judgments; they will make out the character of an age to be all one or all the other. Here is the error. The middle ages laboured under want of knowledge, and they partook also strongly of superstition. Yet in the midst of these defects there was knowledge in some quarters, and there was enlightened religion too. The spirit of the present day tends strongly to scepticism, and it is to be supposed posterity will take this judgment of us. Yet we are not all of us sceptics notwithstanding; no one will say that this is the *whole* account to be given of the present state of opinion, without any sets off to be allowed against it. Is no notice to be taken of all the currents of religious thoughts which have come down to us from an older source, without mixing with the influx of the day? nothing to be said of a rising set of notions not at all in harmony with the age? It would be a truer view then, we think, to take, if, instead of burying an age in this way under the weight of one domineering tendency, we were to look upon every age of the world as prevented providentially from working out its peculiar character to its full; prevented by something stationed within it of a contrary character. We will explain ourselves however more fully on this head, and this will lead us perhaps to one or two reflections by way of inference, on the position of things in the present day.

The Church, we believe to have been the great preservative against superstition in the middle ages. While we think that those ages were superstitious, we believe at the same time that

they had this preservative against the fulfilling their own tendency. Nay, while the Church was even suffering herself from this tendency of things around her, she was at the same time resisting it. It is to no purpose to prove, as people do against us, that the Church was superstitious then. She may have been; she was tried in this way, and she gave way partly under her trial. But on the other hand, she withstood the evil, and she triumphed in the main. This is no uncommon or unintelligible mixture of character in her, to find her in part giving way herself, while, at the same time, she was preventing the world from giving way. It is a character which belongs to our nature; and institutions, even divine ones, have it as well as individuals. The world has benefited from the Church at all times; while the Church on the other hand has only got infection from her contact with the world.

But to return to what we were speaking of. It is well known what part the Church took against the lower and more vulgar kinds of superstitions, which have been laughed down it would seem in the present day. A more serious view was taken of them in the times we are speaking of. "By the doctrines of the Church," says Sir F. Palgrave, "magic and necromancy were severely condemned; and the faggot was denounced against their votaries." We are not going to defend the last mentioned appeal. But when this mistake is remembered on the Church's side, it should be remembered also that she sometimes used her mistaken powers for an enlightened end. Such features coming together, only show us the little reality there is in the system of wholesale inference, which comes to an universal judgment from the least thing making its appearance on one side or the other, just as a geologist, from the merest joint that you submit to his inspection, will describe to you the whole antediluvian animal from which it comes, its size, structure, and propensities. An unaccountable mist had fallen on the Church's eyes in so viewing her powers of censure, and taking the secular sword into her hands, as well as the spiritual. But this does not prevent her views from being perfectly clear and enlightened on other points. And we can hardly doubt that even her error was of service in so *superstitious* an age, for we can use this enlightened language sometimes. There was a temper abroad then which required coercing; and it may be well for posterity that the Church had power to coerce it, though that power in its turn was not divinely and legitimately exercised. *Factum valet*, we may say here, *fieri non debuit*. The dark and wayward impulses, which caused men to fear where no fear was, to tremble but not to adore, were thus encountered by a strong hand; and the superstitious spirit was compelled,

against its will, to erect itself, and look upwards; when, if left alone, it would have tottered and at last fallen irrecoverably.

And a slight insight into the composition of the Church in those days cannot fail to confirm this point in its character. She was then, to a greater degree even than she is now, a receptacle for genius, talents, and application of mind; and seems to have stood rather in the situation which the middle classes occupy now, as representing what we call the intelligence of the day. The middle classes were a less acknowledged body then than now; and the privileges of birth were too marked and overpowering to allow much of an opening to minds which had only their own powers to depend upon. So all the rising intellect in the mass of the people, in the lower and unprivileged classes, which are of course the main strength of society in mind as in every thing else, all tastes and powers of a superior kind, as they manifested themselves here and there, above the level of the possessor's own lot and situation in life, then flowed naturally into the Church, which admitted of no distinction in society in relation to herself, and was therefore always ready to receive and foster them. Persons who, in the present day, might have become eminent physicians, or lawyers of note, or authors and writers in reviews, then found themselves planted in monasteries, where they had leisure to follow their pursuits, in the society of those who could assist and appreciate them. We have no doubt that, could we carry ourselves back for an instant to that age, we should find that it had its literary circles, and its spheres of intelligence, as we say; that the world then, in fact, was not without a few of those interior and self-created worlds, which have pushed themselves into such notoriety since, and threaten to incommode, even to repletion, the first and parental circumference herself, the orbis terrarum, which has enough to do to contain them all. Now, over and above the animal and the vegetable worlds, and the other old established ones of that kind, the moral, the intellectual, and so on, we have now the geological world, the botanical world, the antiquarian world, the phrenological world, besides the fashionable world and the religious world. One meets with several worlds of this kind in travelling down the columns of a newspaper; they are attended by their satellites in the shape of lecturers and corresponding secretaries; and communications are carried on with them through the medium of the twopenny post. But we are wandering from our subject.

We do mean to say, then, that the Church of the middle ages, any more than her descendant of the present day, would always be the better in proportion to the reception she afforded to ex-

isting talents and knowledge, yet it would serve to strengthen her against the prevailing tendency then which lay toward superstition. Sir F. Palgrave has some observations which tend a good deal in this direction, though he brings them to bear on another subject from what we have been considering.

“There was no lack of protectors of popular rights. And where, then, were they to be found ?

“Divesting ourselves of modern opinions and prepossessions, an answer can readily be given by consulting the chronicle and the charter. Amongst the ‘prelates, magnates and proceres,’ are we to seek for all the real and potential materials of the now popular branch of the legislature. Examine the origin, the position, the influence of the dignified ecclesiastics, and the hierarchy will rise before us as the most democratic element of our old English commonwealth.

“Consider the ancient clergy, in their relation to what may be termed the individuality of the country. Much of the value of a popular government consists not, as the demagogue employs it, for the purpose of opposition to authority, but as the means of imparting the benefits and rewards of a well-governed society, in due gradation, to the several ranks and orders of the community. Whatever inequality might subsist in other respects amongst the people, they met on equal terms on sacred ground. For the civil or political ennoblement of talent, the way always opened through the Christian hierarchy. The mitre, the cardinal’s cap, the tiara itself, fell oftenest on the humblest brow. An established Church is the surest possession of the people ; when they pillage the altar they despoil their own property ;—they waste their own means ;—they desolate their own children’s inheritance ;—they rob themselves.

“Such an institution was an easy and acceptable path to greatness, for the lowest of the low : and amongst the prelates, who sometimes constituted the most numerous, and always the most influential portion of the great council, the majority had risen from the humblest rank in society. Were they all truly deserving of their honours ?—Certainly not.—Some, it must be admitted, obtained their advancement by casting aside the real duties of their station, and by making the business of the world their primary object. But this was the sin of the man, and not the vice of the hierarchy.”—p. 219—221.

“The Anglican Church is not an extraneous or oppressive order, possessing a character adverse to the state ; it is not a caste estranged from the community. It is formed out of the people : it exists for the people. The Church, as I have observed, and I repeat the observation, is the democratic leaven of our balanced monarchy. The dignified ecclesiastics of the Church of England were, during the middle ages, always the best, and not unfrequently the only, advocates of the real interests of the poorest, and, therefore, the most defenceless classes. So have they also been, at all times, the means by which the gifts of intellect and intelligence raise the possessor to the highest station in the community, the connecting link between the cottage and the throne.”—p. 223, 224.

But, after all, the main proof of what we have been saying

lies in the Church's preservation of the true creed, not indeed free from corruptions, but still the true creed whole and entire throughout a long and trying period, in which superstition and religion were striving for the mastery. The Church we know is always under trial; it is tried at this time, (if we may speak so boldly on a subject so near home,) and has been tried ever since the change of opinions in this country, by the spirit of infidelity. The former trial was no more difficult perhaps in respect of its character than the present one; still we should remember that it lasted long; and that the long and continuous pressure from without will produce its effects, even taking us at the best.

“*Stillicidi casus lapidem cavat.*”

We do not perhaps bear this sufficiently in mind, and so are not sufficiently grateful to the Church of the middle ages. We pass coolly over its services, and notice only its failures. We remember it only as a Church which admitted transubstantiation, image worship and the invocation of saints; we remember what it added to the word of God, but we forget what it retained—that word itself. We forget that, amidst all its errors, it retained the one, true, and enlightened belief, which is to enlighten us to the end of time. No such easy and ordinary matter this, if we consider it aright; and we know that unreflecting minds experience a kind of superficial surprise in coming across errors that they happen to be protected from themselves. They think it the easiest thing in the world to have avoided them; mere obstinacy alone, and a determination to do wrong, which led men astray; simply maintaining the truth is the simplest of all things, according to their estimate; and, therefore, no thanks, we say, to those who did so maintain it; they only did what lay straight before them; that is, they only did their *duty*. This is all we have to remark on the one side; but we stare, on the contrary, and are astonished when a corruption is brought before us; we think the introduction of it unaccountable; mere roaming into error for error's sake. Now we incline to a different view of this subject, and for the following reasons.

We think we are under obligation to the middle ages for having preserved to us the enlightened form of faith, *i. e.* the creed of the Church. The *tendency* of superstition then, was to destroy that creed. This may safely be said, though we cannot know how far or near the danger came. We know it is a common idea that superstition adds, but does not destroy; and that its only fault is believing too much. It seems inconsistent to say that a creed can be in danger in such an age: but this is not true; and we mistake the character of our antagonist if we

think so. Superstition is *unbelief* as well as belief. That morbid thirst for the marvellous, which finds nothing to satisfy it in the course of providence or the system of truth—which goes on and on despising one stimulus after another

“Till the seared taste from foulest wells
Is fain to slake its fire,”

this is sheer unbelief, and is what many Atheists have actually had under one shape or another. Hobbes of Malmesbury, it is well known, had a strong and uncomfortable sense of powers unseen, and was afraid to be left alone. It is a bad sign when men tremble in the dark only, and cannot bring themselves to fear in the open day. And this is the way of superstition: it withdraws men's minds from the God of heaven and earth—the God of nature, reason, and conscience—to gods of its own—fate and the stars, powers evil and powers good, demons, angels, and saints, a motley company; to any thing whatever, so that it be not divine. A temper like this luxuriates in hopes and fears of a certain kind; only God's providence has no charms for it either way. It will not go out of itself, or exchange the earthly mouldering body for the living and spiritual one. It delights in its own prison-house, and would live for ever in the tomb. And why so? for this reason, simply, that the very idea of the divine, really and properly speaking, becomes lost to the mind by indulging in this dark and slippery course. Superstition gradually removes the true God from his own creation; it owns him not, and is therefore as unconcerned in his presence, as cold and rationalistic as Atheism itself, though it has its own idols of which it stands in the most perfect awe. Religion, we need not say, is the very contrary of all this: its tendency is rather to equalize things—to obliterate, that is, the distinction between the ordinary and extraordinary, natural and supernatural, by lifting up the former to a level with the latter. It views the ordinary as miraculous, and the miraculous as ordinary; and both as equal evidences of God's power and providence; and, therefore, religious minds have none of that determined partiality to the supernatural which we have been considering, because they find enough to impress them in the voice from above speaking to them through their consciences, and in the visible government of the world. They need have no recourse to phantoms for that awe and interest which is supplied to them by the solid realities of life; by the world within, and the world without them.

We have offered the above reflections because we think they bear on the state and trials of the Church in the middle ages; they are, however, capable of being condensed into something

very short and common sense. Superstition, it is acknowledged, has the tendency to introduce "gods many, and lords many;" and if so, it has a tendency, wherever it prevails, not only to cumber, but to efface the Church's creed. And that there was danger in this direction, in the middle ages, we can hardly doubt, when we remember what errors openly prevailed then, and still prevail, in Roman Catholic countries. The invocation of saints and angels, as allowed in the Romanist system, and the ideas entertained of the Virgin Mother, are serious signs. We have no wish to extenuate them; on the contrary, the worse we think of them the more they make for our view, for they betray the strong current of the times which the Church was withstanding, though at the same time it was yielding to it in part. The very corruptions of the Church in this way, become, in another point of view, evidences *for* her; for, while they prove that she failed under trial (so far as those failures went) they prove also the important fact, that she was *tried*. And this fact shows her off to *advantage*, when we come to consider the *truths* she has preserved. As a keeper of the truth she proves to have been, not the inert receptacle of it only, but to have maintained it, as a Church militant, *in spite* of trials, difficulties, and pressure from without.

What we mean to say, then, is this—judging from the errors which crept in during the middle ages, we believe the Faith had then a strong antagonist to cope with, in the superstitious principle, which was ever striving to obscure its light, and dissipate its unity. Superstition may have been a weaker foe than infidelity would have been; still it *was* an enemy then, and always will be, in the degree in which it exerts its influence. It is irreligion at the bottom, disguised under a pallid cast and a mourning habit; it is fear without awe; the love of the supernatural without the knowledge of the divine; it is losing sight of earth without approaching heaven; and despising reason without admitting faith. To what length indeed this influence would have reached, had it been left to itself, or had the course of things continued favourable for its increasing, we cannot say; but it had certainly eaten some way, not *into* (thank God! *that* was impossible,) but some way *round* the Church's creed, toward the period of the Reformation. Symptoms of this kind had been gathering and gaining ground for some ages. There was a disposition to deify what was not God; to worship the human soul, which had undergone its mortal change; and to make man, even upon earth, a rising deity; the source of his own goodness and moral strength. These errors, however, were not incorporated into the

Church till the Council of Trent, hitherto she had only harboured and countenanced them by connivance.

Now just at this juncture an extraordinary change, a new state of things rises up in the world : how, whence or where produced we know not. Knowledge begins to increase, letters to revive; and we find ourselves commencing a new æra of literature, science, politics, and religion. The superstitious spirit withdraws from a contest in which the Church and the age, new intelligence and ancient faith are allied against her; she retires from the unequal field, leaving the two ill-united powers to turn their arms against each other as soon as she is gone; faith to fight against reason, and mystery to oppose science. A formidable prospect we allow; but do we therefore regret the change, and wish the old foe and the old contest back again? By no means: rather when a trial is over, let us be glad that it is over. The Church was matched against superstition, and has come off victorious. So whatever else there may be in store, one trial is over, past, and gone. Come what will, *that* at all events is a blessing. The genius of Romanism no longer threatens our safety. Though she is still allowed to remain, her movements are fixed within certain limits, which she cannot extend, and which are daily closing in around her. Now indeed she is bestirring herself, and pretending to be on the rise again: what a mockery! old age aping the freshness and activity of youth. She is making a stir however, and calling to Atheists, Liberals, and Schismatics of all kind to aid her. She would raise herself to power again by the plan, on which old Rome first gained hers; by appealing to a mixed multitude; a colluvies omnium gentium, as Livy says; by gathering together the sacrilegious and profane, robbers and outlaws; any thing in the shape of present strength. All in vain however. Her day is over, and never can return; so far as we can pronounce with certainty on any dispensation of Providence.

The sons of the Church then may look back with a pleasure and satisfaction of their own, on the great era of the revival of knowledge; though they take a different view of it altogether, from the popular one of the day; though they acknowledge that that era brought great dangers with it, greater, perhaps, than any which existed before. There is a comparison of the two periods in one part of the Merchant and Friar.

“The adversary of mankind devised a new idol, to be adopted by the world as the true Christ, and it remained in the Temple of God for many a year. The age was rude and fierce. Satan took the darker side of the Gospel, its awful mysteriousness, its fearful glory, its sovereign, inflexible justice, and here his picture of the truth ended. God is a consuming fire, so declares the text, and we know it. But we

ought to know more, that God is love also, but Satan did not add this to his religion, which became one of fear. 'The religion of the world was then a fearful religion. Superstitions abounded and cruelties; the noble firmness, the graceful austerity of the true Christian were superseded by forbidden spectres, harsh of eye, and haughty of brow, and these became the patterns or tyrants of a beguiled people.'—pp. 374, 375.

"In the future age of arts and sciences, the religion of the world assumes the chaste aspect of literature and philosophy. Every declaration of God is examined by the measure of our finite understanding. Rationalism is substituted for faith, and just so much of religion retained, as the mind of man can comprehend, and the natural heart approve."—p. 377.

Still a change as such was a relief, as it implied that the old state of trial was over. A new course was now opened for the Church to run; and she could enter on it with hope, vigour, and confidence arising from self-gratulation on the recollection of the past, and from the consciousness of unused strength to cope with the new foe. If we believe that under the superintending eye of Providence all the world's changes have some ultimate tendency to promote the cause of the Church and religion, we can hardly doubt that the great era of change which we are speaking of, had that tendency in some especial way. We say that it had in a negative way, and in relation to the past, though what is to come of it, and what it will work to finally, we are not yet permitted to know. We may say the revival of knowledge came in to relieve the Church from its long struggle with popular superstition; and to relieve it in time before it had given way fundamentally. We know it is generally argued at the present day, that these eras come about by a natural principle of growth in the human mind, the march of intellect as it is called; and that it is nonsense connecting them with any special providence. Our readers, however, we hope, are not of this way of thinking; and therefore we shall continue to view the period of the revival of knowledge in the connection in which we have viewed it; as bearing, and designed by Providence to bear upon the benefiting and disciplining of the Church. Its unaccountable and sudden rise, superior as it was to all human origination, bespeaks, as strongly as any thing can do, a providential interposition for some express end. And we know, as Sir F. Palgrave tells us, that the first step in the progress of the intellect, we mean the discovery of letters, was connected with the issuing of the Mosaic dispensation. But we will extract the whole or the greater part of his passage on this subject; as it all bears intimately on the view we have been taking:—

“ It may appear strange, that, whilst few can be found sufficiently irreverent to deny openly before men that the temporal affairs of the world are under the direct guidance of God, and that empires rise and fall by His behest: still fewer are sufficiently bold to confess before men, that the empire of mind is equally under His control.—But is it not the same ‘ God blessed for ever and ever,’ who ‘ removeth kings, and setteth up kings,’ and who ‘ giveth wisdom to the wise, and knowledge to them that know understanding.’ Are those whom He permits to become the intellectual rulers of mankind independent of Him, who, from his throne, beholds all the dwellers upon earth ? If we inculcate the pursuit of science and literature, upon the assumption that the powers of natural reason are independent of religious light, we virtually deny the supremacy of Providence.

“ This error—so injurious in its practical consequences—is occasioned, in great measure, by our constant habit of considering the history of the religious teaching of the mind, as not merely separable, but in fact separated, from its intellectual instruction, whilst if we admit the one, we shall find that the other is, in fact, identical.—Let us simply consider the application and tendency of the art of writing, the only means of cultivating knowledge, whether precise or speculative. Writing is the corner-stone of the fabric upon which the whole structure of inductive science depends. I will not ask when or how this art became known to man, nor propound the suggestion, plausible, if not conclusive, that all alphabetical characters, however apparently varied, result only from the modifications of one type. But, waiving these inquiries, we possess the most certain and indisputable evidence, that in the order prescribed by Providence with respect to fallen man, the means destined for the preservation of divine truth and for the progress of human knowledge, have been inseparably conjoined.

“ Had this art of speaking to the eye been concealed from man, had letters not been known, the Bible could not have existed. Had not the writing of God been graven upon the Tables, His commandments, even under the theocracy of Israel, could only have been preserved authentically by a perpetual miracle. The absence of written characters would have necessitated a constant effusion of the Holy Spirit for the transmission of divine truths. Had not writing been imparted to us, then all doctrine must have been oral and traditionary: and, writing being absent, how could religious knowledge have been defended against alteration and corruption ? God’s word could not have been intrusted to the natural and unaided memory of man; either our faculties must have been totally altered, for the preservation of the lessons of salvation, or it would have been indispensable that an unbroken succession of inspired preachers should have been raised up, from time to time, from generation to generation, and from age to age. Prophet must have been the disciple of Prophet; Apostle the immediate forerunner of Apostle.—When tempted, we could not have answered, ‘ It is written;’ when seeking comfort, we could not have been told, ‘ It is written.’—Holy Scripture could not have been given for our instruction: and the whole scheme of revelation must have been totally changed.

“ In the cultivation of the human intellect, the first lesson is thus sent forth from the Holy of Holies. The whole rich banquet of human knowledge is composed of the crumbs which have fallen from the table of the Lord. All the records and memorials of literature and science are secondary and derivative: and exist merely because it pleased God that we should continue to learn His will from the Divine Volume, after the bodily presence of the teachers who declared His truths had been withdrawn: and, pursuing the question onwards, we shall still find that the further improvement of intellect proceeds from a source above human control.”—pp. 388—391.

“ Can the annals of technological history afford satisfactory proofs that any one of the great physical inventions which really constitute eras in the history of intellectual or social civilisation, has been produced by the strict analogical inductions of reasoning?—Once opened, the mine has been more and more worked, deeper shafts have been dug, and easier methods discovered of raising the precious ore: yet, not by the skill of the scientific metallurgist, but by the chance footsteps of the herdsman, the first discovery of the hidden source of wealth was made.—Much has been improved, facilities have been gained, powers have been extended, further contrivances happily applied; but we shall be compelled to confess, that in almost every case,—I may say all,—for though there may be exceptions, none are intelligibly recorded,—all great inventions seem, in their first impression, to have been independent either of volition, or of intellectual excellence. They have proceeded from sudden conceptions, descending, fully formed, as from the empyrean world of archetypal ideas, flashing upon the mind without previous investigation. Strangely, unexpectedly, unbidden like a dream, the irradiation excites surprise in the very individual to whom the thought has been imparted, and who, when considering the invention, experiences, like Watt, not the pride of possession, but the pleasurable sense of novelty, which arises from the first contemplation of the results of the discoveries of others. And the inventors, unassisted by the results of practice, or by the lights of education, display nought but the guidance of an unseen power. And why will Intellect refuse to learn humility from her own annals?”—394, 395.

So then, reader, we have now done with the dark ages, and shall not take you back to them again:—

“ *Ultima Cumæi venit jam carminis ætas.*”

We enter now upon a new era: we are launched with the Church, into a new sphere of light, activity and intellect: nay, we were launched 300 years ago: we are now far advanced in our voyage; we have crossed the line, and the light of a meridian sun is reflected splendidly, as we think, from our boundless and unexplored sea. Our pathway is illuminated in every direction, and we are free to take which way we choose; all is open, and all is attractive. The atmosphere around us is clear and genial: gentle

winds are blowing to enliven and refresh us: and a flattering voice is whispering by our side; yes, and we listen to it while it says—"Mar not the hopeful, the awakening scene; which is able to comply with, and to please all our tastes, however comprehensive, however refined. Breathe freely and enjoy the light of day, and let others enjoy it also as yourself. What is it you wish for? What is it which dissatisfies you? Look around you again; and you will find every thing in completeness, which can raise and mature the character of man. Here is stimulus for the active, and serenity for the wise; ample space, and perfect freedom for the movements of the intellect; peace, order, and stability in the social system. Here is that favourable and harmonious balance of principle, which ensues when new-enlightenment and old experience unite. Content you then, and profit by the age you live in; or at any rate, disturb not the peace of others. Above all, no mysteries, no dogmas, we beseech you; no gloom to overcloud a world like this. These things do not suit us; they carry with them a sepulchral savour; they agree but indifferently with the light of the sun; they may be acceptable to the dead, but they do not recommend themselves to the living. Let nothing be introduced to taint the air we breathe, to depress our faculties, to unnerve our spirits; to make us criminals instead of judges. The journeying in dark places, and the lamp of faith have no charms for us, who have the gift of eyesight, and can use it; we love the highways of knowledge, the broad daylight, and the speedy and infallible conveyance." We know not, reader, whether or not your own thoughts have ever whispered you into this conclusion, or attempted to do so; but you will, at any rate, recognize the view as one which you are constantly encountering in the course of your reading; that is, if you are at all in the habit of reading the newspapers, journals, reviews, or public speeches, as they come out. Yes; and flattering promises are held out to us if we will adopt the feelings and system of the age. But we will place them before you in the words of the distinguished writer himself, who is in our mind, so that you may weigh the loss and gain together; and judge of the bargain for yourself:—

"When once the Church of England," says a great preacher of the day, "shall have come down from all that is *transcendental or mysterious* in her pretensions, and quitting the plea of *her exclusive Apostolical derivation*, shall rest more upon that wherein the real greatness of her strength lies—the purity of her doctrines—her deeds of high prowess and championship in the battles of the faith—the noble contributions which have been rendered by her scholars and her sons to that Christian literature which is at once the glory and the defence of Protestantism—the

ready-made apparatus of her Churches and parishes—the unbroken hold which as an establishment she still retains on the mass of society—and her unforfeited possessory right to be reckoned and deferred to as an establishment still—when these the true elements of her legitimacy and power come to be better understood; in that proportion will she be recognized as the great standard and rallying-post, for all those who would unite their efforts and their sacrifices in that mighty cause, the object of which is to send throughout our families in a more plentiful supply those waters of life which can alone avail for the healing of the nation.”

There is a phrase, we believe, in Milton, “fit body for fit head,” and we are reminded of it here; for here we certainly have “fit” expression for “fit” sentiments. The *apparatus of Churches and parishes!* What fortunate moment, may we ask, suggested that choice expression to lure us, the sons of the Church, down from our lofty eminence? The apparatus of parish Churches; may we add the vestries also? and “*ready made*” too. How inviting. Surely, reader, your allegiance must be tried here. We feel anxious about you. And then the weighty topics which succeed—the “unbroken hold as an establishment”—“the right to be reckoned as an establishment still”—“the unforfeited possessory” right! We really did not know that we stood on so solid a basis; at least we never heard such an adamant description of it before. But to proceed more seriously, we think the Lecturer has made a somewhat too precipitate descent from the heights mysterious and transcendental to an apparatus of parishes; that he has

“whirled, leaped and thundered down impetuous to the plain,” in a way not the most favourable for setting off the advantage of his system. Whether a more imposing show might have influenced us or not we cannot say; but we confess, our mysticism, as we are afraid Dr. Chalmers would call it, *does* somewhat stick at taking in a parochial apparatus, as “the pillar and ground of the truth.” We would solicit for a little more of the vague and invisible in our system; more of the poetical, even the air-built, shall we say? if it be only to comply with our weakness. What, all vanished before the iron intellect of the lecturer? Is there no solitary gleam from the visionary world, no tint ethereal to gild—the “apparatus?” Certainly, if Dr. Chalmers meant to put an extinguisher on the sublime, he has succeeded to admiration.

This then is one course proposed to us to pursue, by some who mean to give us good advice, and wish to see us flourishing. The Church, as we said before, has entered on a new state of trial; for we think the new era is such; and the question is, what

are we to do under it? We are told by the party above described to drop our mysteries; and then we shall be acting *suitably* to the age, *suitably* to the circumstances of trial in which we are placed. But let us pause and consider here. Is there no fallacy in that word *suitable*? We may be acting *suitably* to the age, by not suiting ourselves to it: and the question is whether the latter is not the most *suitable* way of the two, the part which the Church was designed to take. 'This for any thing we know, and there is much to make us think so, may have been the final cause why enlightenment was introduced. The age may have received her enlightenment in order that the Church might be mysterious in spite of it. In this way the topic of the "age" turns round upon its supporters: sides are changed in the argument, and the secret of our strength is found to lie within the very bosom of our antagonist. The times of darkness, you tell us, are passed, and this is an age of knowledge. True: but what then? No time, therefore, for retaining mysteries, you proceed immediately to say. Now there we join issue with you. We take up your "therefore" before you have done using it; and we say *therefore* this is the age of all ages for *holding* the mysteries of the faith. The Church should be always enlightened indeed, and always mysterious; but it is of special moment that she should be enlightened in a superstitious age, mysterious in a scientific. All things are double one of another; and they are double in an opposing way: as the passive and the active, the seal and its impression—τύπος ἀντίτυπος καὶ πῆμ' ἐπὶ πῆματι κεῖται. An enlightened Church, (taking the common idea of it,) and an enlightened age going together, are a sad chaotic barren formation. They are two identities as it were; two likenesses, copies of each other; no fitness in them; nothing reciprocal; all partial, nothing whole. All is one-sided, and goes one way, all wastes and runs to seed. The world escapes from controul and goes off at a tangent; it pursues the irrecoverable course, beyond all interference of the centralizing power, beyond the sphere of gravity, of system, and of law. It takes its own direction, and is carried on like the arrow of Lucretius, fatally, interminably, inevitably, in that one line, with the whole of space before it, which it must go through or at any rate never stop going through. Homer was evidently in a difficulty how to describe the chimera, when he said

"Πρόσθε λέων, ὅπιθεν δὲ δράκων, μέσση δὲ χίμαρα,"

the world has been yet more puzzled to describe the like malformation, which our modern science of magic would conjure up if it could; and which it has well nigh conjured up already. An enlightened age indeed,—all intellect, all science, all reason,—

this is untowardness, obliquity in the extreme. No, the age must be set right, if possible. It must be set on its legs again, if it will permit us to say so. We must introduce some evenness, some proportion into our movements; we must have recourse to a counterbalancing system, to steady and preserve us. The more science there is on the one side, the more need exists for mystery on the other; and the Church, so far from yielding to circumstances, and withdrawing her pressure upon the world, should fix and establish it more firmly than ever.

We must drop one line, if the truth is to be told, a few fathoms deeper than we have for some time past; and bear the reproach and the invidiousness of the proceeding as we can. There will be complaining and accusing no doubt; and we shall have to answer the charge that was made of old, "We have piped unto you, but ye have not danced, we have mourned unto you, but ye have not wept." If it should be so, we hope to maintain our fortitude and sincerity under the attack. In the meantime, however, it should be known that the Church has certain independent grounds and resources of her own, and cannot allow herself to be put out of place by the tide of opinions flowing against her. It would be inconsistent in her behaving so, seeing that she planted herself there for the express purpose of opposition. This, as we have said, is the particular theory we hold respecting our position in the scheme of things, a theory which, as will be acknowledged, amply protects us from all arguments grounded on the folly, inutility, weakness, presumption, absurdity and danger of such opposition. Assuming the theory as we do to begin with, we are safe from all such dire results of it, as far as affects our purpose of acting. We are disciples of that stubborn, incomplaisant, unaccommodating rule, the rule of contrary; the peculiar character of which is to gather strength, rather than uncertainty, from the side opposed to and conflicting with it. Thus there is no dealing with it in any way: it stoutly resists modification. It has no character to support in the department of the polite and agreeable; and therefore acts with freedom and unconcern in the line it adopts, and goes on in short altogether incorrigibly whether for right or wrong.

All this being the case, it follows that the part we have to act in this scientific age is already laid down for us, and that we cannot alter it, without inverting and undoing the relation in which the Church and the age, the age and the Church stand to each other. The age is all light: therefore the Church is bound to be—we will not say, dark, for that is an ill-omened, forbidding word: but we will say, deep, impenetrable, occult in her views and character. Nay, we will not object to a certain measure of light;

so that it be of the dim and awful kind, not borrowed from the world without, but genuine, native, taking its rise within her bosom, as the spark is elicited from the unpromising and opaque flint. But something of this kind we must have : a retreat from our too much light, " a refuge from the storm, a shadow from the heat." We must have a Church that protects herself from the powerful and noxious glare which settles upon her from without; that pitches her tabernacle, and covers herself in, and so forms beneath her shelter an imperium in imperio; an interior empire of peace, an unseen world under the full light of reason and science. It is wonderful how people cannot understand that shade is the more agreeable, the more suitable, the more necessary beneath the burning sun. It is acknowledged that the tendency of the age is to wither and emaciate our religious creed. Then surely the obvious thing is to retire still further under shelter; to bury ourselves still more deeply in the recesses of hidden truth; not gratuitously to uncover ourselves, and invite the sun's heat. There is a pestilence that walketh in darkness, and there is a sickness that destroyeth in the noon day. The superstition of the middle ages was the former; the pride of intellect in the present day represents the latter. If we do not adopt a somewhat deeper system than has prevailed for some time past, for the last century especially, we shall certainly be overpowered: we shall not be able to hold out against the influence of the age. The more we reflect upon our case, the more strongly must this approve itself to us. The scientific character of this time, we would say again and again, is a call to us not to be carried along with it; but to go so much the more decidedly the contrary way. So thinks Sir F. Palgrave, and we are glad to extract a passage which so completely bears us out in all we have been saying.

"The guardians of the truth," it is the Friar speaking, "will be cajoled to surrender the integrity of the sacred volume: and to accept the sophistries of earthly wisdom as an adequate compromise. It will prompt them to prophesy smooth things, in order to purchase a hollow truce from those who despise the law of the Lord."

But what is the Friar's own view?

"*The more the empire of man is extended over nature, the more should we endeavour to diminish the temptations inducing him to live by sight and not by faith: and thus withdrawing his dependence from the Lord of Spirits, and substituting his earthly idol for the Father of Heaven.*"—p. 379.

There are persons, indeed, now, according to the Friar's prophecy, and not a few of them, who wish to go certain lengths and

no farther; to cut down one truth, to round off another. This is not the way to save the faith from falling,—if it is allowable to use such an expression, knowing as we do the sure promise on which it stands. To capitulate in this way inch by inch is a miserable process. If the truth is maintained, (as we know that it is to be,) no thanks to the judiciousness of this class of defenders, any more than to their courage. No: we cannot pick and choose what parts of the true system to hold by, what to cast off; we must either defend the whole, or give up the whole. And the *whole* is a mysterious thing, if we take in all of it. It is only a part here and there broken off from the system that can be maintained on the accommodating plan. If the truth is preserved to the last, it will have been owing to those who seemed at the time to go deeper than was necessary; to be too dark and unreasonably severe in their doctrines and mode of thinking. There is a great dread in persons' minds of that over high standard: but we may put it to their plain reason, is not that the *safe side now*, whatever it was in the middle ages? What is the tendency, may we ask, of the present day: is it to superstition or to scepticism? We know the uncommon fear of *popery* which is abroad; but with all deference to persons' sensibility on that head, we do not think their fear is so oppressive, as it appears to be. Persons who reflect at all, can scarcely think there is *much* danger of the age turning Roman Catholic, whereas on all hands it is acknowledged, that there is great danger the other way, to rationalism, that is, infidelity.

This view of the relation in which we stand to the age is on the whole a cheerful one, though it gives us something to do. If science, by the rule we have been giving, is turned into stimulus to the mysterious principle in our system, then science is our friend and ally, in spite of itself. Only we must turn it in this very direction, and in no other. The Church of the middle ages was tried in its own way; and had to resist accordingly: it had to oppose superstition by enlightenment. That trial has passed off long ago, happily we may say; fortunately, providentially for the Church: we may congratulate ourselves that it is over; though it has left us another antagonist, and a more difficult one to cope with. The revival of knowledge put the Church in a new state of trial; it brought in another antagonist upon us, which was to be met as the former was in its own way. We are now assailed by science, and we must protect ourselves by mystery. That is the line which it peculiarly falls to us to adopt. It is as clearly the Church's time to be mysterious now, as it was its part to be enlightened in the middle ages. Mystery fits in with this age exactly; it suits it; it is just what the age wants, if it only knew what its wants were. As for one being an en-

lighted, a moderate, a charitable church, that is all beside its purpose; of course we are all that and more; but that is not the character which should specially belong to us, and which was designed for us, as the effect at once and the means of supporting our peculiar state of trial. It is no great credit to us to be enlightened, *i. e.* not superstitious; our trial does not lie that way, and we could not well be otherwise. *Depth* of doctrine is what we are to look to, and what we may boast of, if we maintain it properly. But it is absurd to be congratulating ourselves on our enlightenment, when that is not at all the point in question; this is like being valiant when there is no danger, and running away when there is.

We will just add another suggestion before concluding. If science could be brought to act upon the Church in the way we have been describing, might not this have an effect in its turn upon the scientific world? We do not dream about converting the age, but here and there an impression might be made upon it, by a deep and authoritative system of Church teaching, which might issue in a higher and more moral school of science growing up among us, than we possess at present; a school which would bow low before the majesty of irresistible truth, retaining at the same time its own immutable decrees respecting nature and the world, and reigning supreme in its own sphere of certainty. Why should we not have the imposing union of science and mystery in the same minds? There is nothing in the nature of things to prevent their meeting; though they must both descend deep, to come to the root and basis of their agreement. But science, it stands to reason, must be atheistic, wherever a superficial creed predominates; this we must reckon upon, and take up with our own share of the blame, so far as our own deficiencies have originated or encouraged the evil. We are trying now to convert men of science by giving them what in exchange? Nothing at all: that is to say, an intellectual, a "*reasonable*" religion, a thing that nullifies itself. Why, how unmeaning, how impolitic is this? Your men of science do not care for a religion that is so completely in their own line: they have enough of that quality of thing *in* their own line. A scientific religion must of course be the poorest of all things to them, and can only excite that species of contempt, which we feel on seeing any system or individual trying to do things out of its line; and, therefore, of course failing, and making itself ridiculous in the attempt. Religion loses itself entirely, if it affects the merely systematic, the reasoning, the philosophical; all this is wholly unsuitable to it. No: it must be itself, and stand on its own ground; and there, whatever be thought of its error or truth, there, is a solid something to offer to persons'

acceptance, and men must give it their respect, even if they refuse it their submission. But nothing is gained otherwise. Scientific men know clearly enough their superiority over religion *in their own line*, and will answer you as the Cyclops did Ulysses.

Οὐ γὰρ κύκλωπες Διὸς Αἰγυίοχου ἀλέγυσιν,
Οὐδὲ θεῶν μακάρων, ἐπειὴ πολὺ φέρτεροι εἰμέν.

A modernized religion they regard of course as only a meagre imitation, of what they have themselves already in an infinitely more perfect degree. It is as if the country tried to entertain the town with its own regularity, and put its farms and cottages accordingly into rectangular order, row and alley, street and square, when the real fact was, that we went into the country, to see the country, not to see the town over again; much less make a miserable apology for the town character.

It would be ungrateful to finish our article without one or two observations more on the Merchant and Friar; especially after making the use of it we have. Extracts of course cannot do justice to such a work; they are necessarily limited, and are confined to some one or two subjects, out of all those which the author treats of: for the ordinary limits of an article do not admit of noticing more. We can only say it is the most varied book we ever read, for so small a one; combines the humorous and the philosophical in a very happy and complete way indeed: besides containing a great deal of information, historical, political, and antiquarian, on the state of things in the middle ages, principally of course in our own country. Our sense of gratitude obliges us to say thus much, from the entertainment which the book has given us in reading; not that we suppose at all that an author so well known as Sir F. Palgrave stands in need of our recommendation. However these are secondary features. Perhaps the most gratifying thing after all, is to see a mind constituted with a strong taste and admiration for the scientific, in the way Sir F. Palgrave's evidently is, combining with that taste real depth and power of thought on moral and religious subjects, and the true reverential spirit which bespeaks the churchman. This is a rare combination in the present day; and therefore when it does come across us, we have all the greater value for it. Sir Francis throws out a promise in his preface, that "should opportunity be given, he may hereafter enter into a full view of the study of Physical Science in the Middle Ages." We only hope that this opportunity will be given to him, and that he will take the advantage of it he proposes to himself doing.

ART. VI.—1. *A brief History of the Church in Upper Canada: containing the Acts of Parliament, Imperial and Provincial, Royal Instructions, Proceedings of the Deputation, Correspondence with the Government, Clergy Reserves' Question, &c. &c.* By William Bettridge, B.D., (St. John's College, Cambridge,) Rector of Woodstock, Upper Canada, one of the Deputation from the late Bishop of Quebec, the Bishop of Montreal, and the Archdeacons and Clergy of Upper Canada. London. 1838. 8vo. pp. 143.

2. *The Stewart Missions; a Series of Letters and Journals, calculated to exhibit to British Christians the Spiritual Destitution of the Emigrants settled in the remote Parts of Upper Canada; to which is prefixed a brief Memoir of the late Hon. and Right Rev. Chas. James Stewart, Lord Bishop of Quebec, &c.* Edited by the Rev. W. J. D. Waddilove, M. A., St. John's College, Cambridge, late Prebendary of Ripon, and Domestic Chaplain to his Grace the Duke of Roxburgh. London: Hatchard and Son. 1838. Sm. 8vo. pp. 252.

3. *A Letter to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, occasioned by the recent Meeting in support of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts.* London: Stewart. 1838.

WE rejoice at the interest which is gradually becoming felt in the cause of the Church in Canada. Of all missionary efforts those which apply to the colonies are the most legitimate; and indeed if the state discharged what we are wont to consider its duty, there is no reason why the most distant dominions of the Queen should be in any degree behind England itself in the means of religious instruction and worship. Kings, we are taught, are entrusted with dominion, in order that in its exercise they may "seek God's honour and glory;" they no more divest themselves of this obligation in one part of their empire than another; towards all their subjects they extend an equal interest, a comprehensive undivided protection.

Should we suppose any King, possessing far larger and more real authority, than is assumed in modern theories of government, animated with zeal for religion, and pursuing his task with worthy and large affections, it would easily be thought that as far as promoting the cause of religion goes, remoteness of district, meanness of race, recency of acquisition, would by no means interrupt his equal care for the spiritual welfare of his subjects, and that if there were any quarter where protection was most given, it would be where he might feel it to be most needed.

Democracy possesses the happy art of dispensing with every feeling of higher and generous affection ; it has no human heart ; it is not a man, but a system. Where feelings in their nature individual, are required from bodies social, they are apt to become diluted to nothing in the diffusive medium they pass through. Kings and queens can be fathers and mothers of their country, but we shall vainly hope for parental fondness in a parliament or a congress.

The advocates, indeed, of the popular principle afford the best evidence against themselves, in the manner in which their schemes of patriotism are generally developed ; they talk of their own "enlightened views" and "liberal measures," but when their philanthropy is brought to the test, it discovers too obviously that it is instigated by *theory*, and not by *feeling*. "Philanthropists," indeed, is all that they pretend to be ; affectionate and simple motives are really unnamed in their vocabulary ; and the sort of feeling which we have now referred to, with which a king, knowing and caring for his sacred office, would almost watch for the neediest and remotest quarter of his empire, as the sphere for his more earnest bounties, may be compared with that well-known act of Lord Grey's government which withdrew from the cause of religion in the British colonies the annual public grant of £15,600 ; while the present modified arrangement of that measure refuses *all public aid* to ministers of the Church who have become employed in either Upper or Lower Canada after 1833, and deprives above 100 clergymen, occupied in the North American colonies before that time, of a large part of their previous incomes.*

We mention this at present but as an example of the *tendency* of the democratic temper ; and, practically, it is only of tendencies that we speak. We do not affirm that the constitution of this country affords an absolute development either of the monarchical or democratic principle of government ; but as the democratic principle has recently been brought more into action, we cannot help noticing, that its effects are felt in a certain heartlessness of legislation, which we suppose must be proved to be impolitic or unpopular before the legislature will consider it criminal. And certain we are that that temper will not be permanently acceptable in this country ; doubtless far purer and more genuine feelings are already rapidly prevailing in the hearts of a great portion of the people of England.

Whatever plausibility of *argument* the democratic principle is

* See Report of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel for 1837, p. 19 ; and Bettridge's History of the Church in Upper Canada, p. 53.

susceptible of, there is this to be said against it, that argument it always *requires* ; it is not a first conviction ; to a simple and free mind, anti-monarchical feeling is nearly as unnatural as anti-filial feeling. The teachers of modern politics profess to be instructing mankind in something they were not aware of ; their theories are no calling back to antiquated notions, they rather disown them ; every body who dissents from themselves is dull and unenlightened ; in other words, before a man can understand their views he must be *indoctrinated* into them.

We desire to connect these remarks with the relation in which England is at present placed to her colonies. Here is an ancient country, whose children have for the most part been bred up in her own principles, freemen* by inheritance, loyal by nature, and not uneducated in some of the best truths and feelings which education can ever confer. We are so used to a newspaper tone of politics, necessarily a tone of discussion and collision, that it is difficult to enter into what may be supposed to be the *political* feelings of the great bulk of the agricultural population ; that quiet homely temper, which is one of the virtues of England. If we inquire for the tone which might be anticipated among the inhabitants of the more rural districts, it is not to a newspaper or a county election that we must have recourse ; it is said that simple untaught minds are not apt to theorize, but as far as they do theorize, they are safe and genuine philosophers. Their convictions are the patient work of a plain and ordered life, taught by its own habits, unlettered perhaps, but not uninstructed ; the village church which stands beside their households, and where their forefathers rest—the returning worship which in the backward years has ceased not through unremembered generations—the intercourse of kindness to which they have been bred up from infancy with the neighbouring mansion of some long known lord of the soil—the more sacred relations to their spiritual pastor—are elements of English character which are not, for they cannot be, inoperative.

Suppose then a people imbued with the prepossessions and feelings which such instruments of education have contributed, fraught with a native loyalty and simplicity of spirit, and carrying in their breasts a ground-work of religious conviction, going out in hundreds and in thousands, whole households together crossing the Atlantic, and settling in the newly opened forests of Canada ;

* “ One of the congregation,” says Mr. Green, a missionary in Upper Canada, “ accompanied me some miles to guide me through the woods ; he remarked, ‘ I have liberty enough ; all the liberty I now desire is the liberty of having a Church and Sabbath Schools as at home, and not to be left to ourselves as we now are.’ ”—*Stewart Mission*, p. 16.

pilgrims, but still in one sense upon English ground. Do they foresee that that country, though so long the property of the British crown and inhabited by English settlers for generations, is, as far as the soul is concerned, almost a desert; scarcely churches or ministers, except at exceedingly remote intervals, in a region larger than England itself, and in fact a portion in the British empire no longer theirs, if in that is understood a free inheritance in the worship and privileges of the National Church? It was a part of their loyalty, that they reckoned on *finding* the Church of England, whatever part of the British empire they might be led to colonize; whatever provision their sovereign might make for them, a religious provision would be the foremost; it is not less the fruit of popular legislation that no such care has been shown for the tens of thousands whom this country has induced to emigrate. We are not, indeed, arguing on speculation in speaking of *surprized* and *disappointed* feelings, as those with which the new colonists, when first they arrive in their future country, discover the miserable provision that has been made for their religious welfare; though it is doubtless but too true to the character of human nature, that what at first was felt as a want becomes afterwards comparatively a matter of indifference; yet still their longings and the hunger of the soul may at seasons return; new employments, new associates, active calls upon their industry, may make them forget, for a month or a year, the calmer and less exciting claims of those deeply-seated instincts, whose longings are heavenward; but old religious habits and privileges which had been constantly associated with their earlier days will at times come over them, like a long-forgotten strain; and still more will it be to English parents a keen feeling, to see their children growing up around them unbaptized, uninstructed, unused to God's house, and unblest in the privileges of the Gospel.

We take, from a multitude, the following instances of that *spiritual hunger* of which we are speaking. The first is an Address to the Archdeacon of Quebec, signed by fifteen heads of families (one of them a widow) in a newly settled district of Lower Canada.

“ Venerable Sir,

“ We, the undersigned heads of families in this settlement, feeling considerably a want in a spiritual way, do humbly pray that you would let us have, as often as possible, a minister to administer the sacrament, baptism, &c. &c., as the Protestant population here is considerable, as will appear in the return forwarded . . . and we do also pray that you would appoint a schoolmaster, under the Royal Institution, such as would instruct our children in the fear of God, and who might

read the Church of England service in the absence of the minister. And, as in duty bound, we will ever pray."*

From a similar document, dated Broughton, we extract the following words.

"A clergyman is so much desired in this place that I am induced to inform you of the offers which have been made. My father says he would willingly give him 100 acres of land, and the heads of families that they would cheerfully contribute their mite towards his support. It is true there are not more than thirty families, and amongst that number three or four Catholics; but it is supposed that it would be a great inducement for many more to settle; beside, his duty would not so entirely confine him as to prevent him attending Aubert Galleon and Belle Alliance."

With regard to the concession that this petition was made in behalf of *only thirty families*, we may remind our readers that that number exceeds the population of many parishes in England.

From the inhabitants of Aubert Galleon, and Belle Alliance, (mentioned in the preceding document,) we find similar testimony to the spiritual state of the *new settlements* in Canada. In these places and their neighbourhood, a subscription was entered into by the inhabitants, prefaced by resolutions, from which we extract the following.

"In order to establish the public worship of God amongst us, on a permanent basis, it is necessary that we should, according to our means, contribute certain sums of money annually, for the support and maintenance of a regularly ordained minister of the Gospel.

"As new settlers, our limited means do not enable us at present to afford adequate means to support any respectable minister of the Gospel, without assistance from our fellow Christians.

"As the venerable Society in England for propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts contribute largely to support, in the North American colonies, clergymen of the Church of England, and as we believe that Church to be a pure branch of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, we are of opinion that a clergyman of that Church, deriving part of his support from the liberality of the said society, or from some other source, would be most suitable to our circumstances, and also that his ministry would be acceptably exercised among us."

The subscription entered upon by these petitioners, as the bishop states in his letter, contained three sorts of annual contribution; "one in money, one in produce, and a *third, from those who had nothing else to give, in personal labour.*"

"Notwithstanding," says Bishop Stewart in 1834, "*the generally flourishing state of the colony, the persons are but few in number who*

* See "A Letter to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, from the Bishop of Montreal," p. 19.

have it in their power to subscribe largely for this object, (incomes for a resident clergy,) and these again are subjected to constant appeals to their bounty *from the distressed portion of the emigrant population*, as well as in behalf of the various public institutions and improvements now carrying on in this country."

"I have frequently," says a travelling missionary, the Rev. Mr. Green, in 1836, a period of comparative distress, "had offers of land and lumber for the erection of churches, and *subscriptions of work* to a very large amount."—*Stewart Missions*, p. 155.

"So many," he observes in another instance, "are the wants of the emigrant at first, and so very dear is every article, that quickly all the little capital they bring out vanishes away, and so far from being able to contribute to the erection of churches or the maintenance of a ministry, they are unable to procure even for themselves many of the most necessary articles belonging to their condition."—p. 171.

"I stopped at a tavern," says the above named missionary, "where the mistress of the house, learning I was a clergyman, refused to take more than half-price for each article supplied to myself and for my horse."—p. 204.

At another place, a tavern keeper refused to accept of the same missionary the payment of any charge whatever.

These are symptoms of the religious tone of feeling in the country; remnants of inherited impressions, which remind us, if it be not too familiar a comparison, of the lines in the *Deserted Village*;—

"Where once the garden smiled,
And still where many a garden-flower grows wild."

We add, however, a few further quotations from the journals and letters of various missionaries, all denoting the spiritual condition of *the Upper Province*; we recite them as they have occurred to us, in a volume already referred to.

Mr. Elliot says,

"I have over and over heard the members of the Church observe, 'that, though they belong to the Established Church of the empire, they are the most neglected and destitute denomination of Christians in this flourishing country.'"—*Stewart Missions*, p. 95.

We may compare with this the Bishop of Quebec's letter, printed in the same work, p. 144.

"There is not any provision for any new missionaries in either Upper or Lower Canada, and they are greatly needed by large congregations. The largest new and destitute congregations are for the most part emigrants from Great Britain and Ireland, not long settled, and able to do little or nothing towards the maintenance of a ministry."

"I should not omit to mention that an instance came under my own eyes, of a member of the Church travelling *nearly forty miles*, where the

roads were very bad, for the purpose of communicating in the Lord's Supper."—p. 160.

"One woman had come eighteen miles for the purpose of getting her child baptized."—p. 162.

"A large congregation having assembled at the appointed hour, a few had prayer-books, but did not know how to use them. Many of them, born in this country, never heard, I should think, the Church service read, nor even a Church minister preach,—one told me so,—another remarked, the prayer-books are of no use to us, as we cannot and do not know how to find the places, not having used them in public service for the last fourteen years. (Date March 6, 1836.) 'The only drawback,' said an English gentleman at the same settlement, 'to this country, is the want of churches and clergymen. It is a fine country for poor men, but for my part I have had often serious thoughts of leaving my present residence, and settling again near the means of grace.' "—p. 187.

"I attended a funeral this day; only those who live here, and have an opportunity of witnessing the destitution of this country, can fully know or feel how bitter a thing it is to be obliged to cover up their dead, without the solemn rites and attendance of a Christian minister."—p. 189.

"They are emigrants from Ireland, and had been settled near Troy, in the United States, for some years. With the hope of obtaining land they removed to this country, but one of them expressed, in the most affecting manner, the deep sorrow he felt for consenting to adopt such a step for worldly advantage; as they were now deprived of every service of the Church, which they had enjoyed in their former settlement."—p. 197.

Troy is in the diocese of New York, United States.

"I was lately driving towards the Huron tract, to keep an appointment, and was recognized upon the way by a person on horseback; having inquired the place and the hour at which I intended to hold divine service, he at once relinquished the object of his ride, although within a short distance of the place to which business was carrying him, and accompanied me back, riding nearly ten miles to attend the public worship of God."—p. 249.

The following is from Mr. Bettridge's account (History of the Church in Upper Canada, p. 95) of a colony of English settlers, (from the county of Devon,) in the Huron tract.

The mother of a family, on his stopping by chance at her cottage, inquired whether he were a clergyman of our Church?—"We have been here these two years and a half, and we have never heard nor seen a

* Within three miles of the spot on which I write, says the editor of the *Stewart Missions*, (we believe the north of England,) I have the instance of a respectable family, which emigrated with sufficient means and habits of industry, promising temporal advantage, yet were so unhappy in the destitution of spiritual comforts, that they returned, professing that they could not, for any earthly good, bear the misery of living in a country where no difference existed between Sunday and work-day.

clergyman all the time.' He promised to remain for a few hours; messengers were sent through the settlement, the noise of the wood-cutters presently ceased, and they all came flocking into the place he was staying in. There were from 100 to 150 souls in the settlement, 'members of the Church, without one exception;' after he had baptized the whole of their unbaptized children, he left them, entreating him that he would return again, and assuring him, 'they did not wish itinerant teachers to come amongst them, as it was difficult to know who they were, or whether they came with sound doctrine.' "

These details are indications of that remaining earnestness of religious feeling, which exists through a great variety of districts, both in Upper and Lower Canada; how poorly met, how poorly provided for, our readers are aware. It must be remembered, however, that the real needs of the colony are not to be measured by the *demands* for spiritual assistance; these are but the encouragements to afford assistance, while the real claim upon the mother-country is not the *complaints* of her petitioners, but their silence. At present, English recollections may recall the associations of their ancient faith; they remember the "church-going bell,"* their village worship, its mysteries of creed and Sacrament; and they can yearn for them still; but, unfed, such desires must in time pass away; and wasteful moments are these, while they are being suffered to escape; for of all missionary labours, theirs, as far as *success* goes, is the dreariest, who among a nation once Christian, and which has renounced its faith, have the task of re-awakening whole towns or villages which have become unbelieving and depraved.

It is too probable, that this is already the case in many parts of the North American colonies of England; "while men slept, the enemy hath sown tares." Indeed, it seems only in chance instances, mere islands amid the desert, that genuine religious earnestness is practically realized; in many quarters, not even the name of religion is perhaps professed.† We must not be unprepared also

* "Some females, speaking of the hope entertained by some of their friends of procuring a small bell for a church in their neighbourhood, added with animation, 'That would indeed sound like Sunday once again.' "—*Stewart Missions*, p. 177.

† Every one knows that the most dangerous errors are at this moment propagated through the province with alarming success. In the present state of religion in the colony, it is easy to seduce into error a large portion of the population, who are not grounded in the principles of Christianity, and have had no opportunity of acquiring religious knowledge. . . . In fact, the people, scattered as they necessarily must be in a new country like this, are not only destitute of the information necessary for self-defence, but of all the means of acquiring it, and are therefore apt to become the adherents of every species of error prepared for their acceptance. It is not uncommon to find people, who have professed many different forms of Christianity, changing from one denomination to another, till they make a total shipwreck of the faith, and at length discard religion altogether."—*Address of the Archdeacon of York, Upper Canada, to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry*, p. 3, 4 (1837.)

for worse than ignorance, in districts so nearly adjoining to the penal settlements; the amplest efforts of the Church would perhaps be not more than sufficient to cleanse a moral atmosphere so necessarily infected. And what does the nation do, to aid the Church in its task? It has made it its policy, for many years, to invite great numbers of its population to the North American colonies; indeed an examination of accounts of the population of Upper Canada presents an appalling increase in *numbers*, who year by year thus relinquish unawares the religious privileges, which in England had been afforded them.

The entire population of Upper Canada was in 1783 about 10,000.

In 1814—95,000.

In 1820—134,000.

In 1825—211,713.

In 1833—355,554.

And Mr. Bettridge (p. 115) computes it to be now 503,554; while he states the number *annually* immigrating at no less than 27,000. Indeed, unless the recent insurrection has discouraged emigration, this average ought to be stated at somewhat higher. In the address of the Bishop of Quebec in 1834, (already quoted,) he says, “ of 51,000 emigrants who arrived from the British Isles in 1832, 30,000 settled in Upper Canada;” and in 1836 we are informed (*Stewart Missions*, p. 154) that 20,000 souls entered Upper Canada, in four months only, between April 1 and August 1.

Upper Canada is divided into twelve districts;* and for the spiritual instruction of the people, at least ten clergymen are requisite in each district. Such is the statement of Mr. Elliot, a missionary well acquainted with the spiritual condition of several portions of the province. Indeed, if we consider either the extent or population of Upper Canada, this provision is extremely small. (It is professedly the smallest provision *possible*, giving to God no more than *must* be given Him.) It is probably difficult to ascertain the exact limits of the inhabited province, since new lands are constantly being taken in as successive settlers enter; the first range being that bordering on the St. Lawrence, Lake Ontario, and Lake Erie; and settlements being made backward from these, toward those on Lake Huron on the north. The entire length of the southern settlements is perhaps 500 miles; the depth (from south to north) varying from 50 to some hundred miles; so that for a tract obviously larger than England, the number of clergy equired on the demand of missionaries now

* Mr. Bettridge (p. 135), enumerates eleven districts.

there, is only 120, less by 200 than a tithe of the number who are labouring in this land. Comparing, again, the number of clergy asked for, with the population of Upper Canada; 120 clergy for the care of 355,554 souls, will leave to each clergyman the charge of about 3000 souls; 1200 being the utmost which a clergyman (in England) can superintend; and this moreover with multitudes to catechise in the first truths, both infants and adults, churches and schools to build, and large portions of the charge entrusted to him, to reclaim from errors often inveterate.

At present it appears that there are *but fifty-one clergy** in the province; and well can the feelings be understood with which they are entreating for help from this happier country, needy as even England itself is, in the supply of clergy the least adequate to its population. Still we think it may with boldness be said, if any man has freely the choice before him, to remain in England, or to minister to the Church in Canada, he would wisely make the latter his choice.

With respect to the funds required for the present necessities of the Church in Canada, the number of churches now needed is stated by Mr. Bettridge to be 360, one in each township of 10 miles square. In the remote districts the expense of building is great; but Mr. Bettridge estimates the erection of each church at so small an amount as 200*l.*, half of which would be supplied by the settlers. The sum therefore remaining to be subscribed for building churches, will be 36,000*l.* The *immediate* expenses of each minister for passage, &c., will be 50*l.*, and his annual stipend 150*l.* Supposing the congregations to pay half of this amount, the sum asked from this country will be 9000*l.* annually, and an immediate subscription, as above stated, of 42,000*l.*

This estimate, however, is like that of another missionary already referred to, as *scanty* as it can be made. Each clergyman would have the charge of *three churches*, in itself an anomalous course; for in that case, if Sundays and the other festivals are observed in one of his churches, he must probably omit them in the others; and if a larger number than usual of communicants attend at the altar, he will be tempted to take up with the system which has of late sprung up, of distributing the divine elements "collectively," instead of in the appointed manner. Baptisms also and catechizing must be hurried over, lest the service should encroach upon a subsequent one at a different church; not to mention the difficulty of committing to the same minister the task of reading prayers over and over in the same day, and thus

* In a letter of the Rev. R. D. Cartwright, Assistant Minister of St. George's, Kingston, Upper Canada, to a Clergyman at Belfast, printed in the Oxford Herald, May 26, 1838, the computed number of clergy is stated as "nearly 60."

tempting him to feel the importance of *preaching* more than that of *prayer*. Indeed the notion of one minister, with one house of prayer, where he will be daily interceding *for*, and, if they will, *with* his people, would be altogether lost in the proposed plan of three churches to each parochial division. Again, the divisions proposed are far larger than the clergy could really superintend. They would be almost of the size of an English county; about seventeen miles and one-third square would be the average extent; and it would be scarcely possible for any intercourse to subsist between the clergy and each family under their charge, at least so as to leave time for public prayer, and for those habits of occasional study and retirement, which missionaries, whose life is one of so much excitement, must be peculiarly anxious to obtain. It is sometimes felt in the poorer districts of England, and the case would seem to be still more frequent in Canada, that the means of the clergy are not a little diminished, in consequence of the *extent* of their charge putting them to much consequent expense; in one instance we find a missionary petitioning the Bishop of Quebec for a sufficient sum to purchase *a horse*; another has so large a charge, as to be obliged to keep three; and it is obvious that in a parish of seventeen miles, this source of expense would be almost unavoidable. Mr. Bettridge, nevertheless, supposes the assigned income of each clergyman to be only 150*l.*; he makes no consideration of the erection of a house, or the expense of lodging; though building, as we have already had occasion to notice, is said to be expensive in the more remote districts; and in one instance among the expenses of a missionary to the Indians, the item of *house-rent* is 25*l.* Almost every necessary article is correspondingly costly; in some instances *provisions* are carried the distance of fifteen miles, and the cost of *clothing* is likewise great; so that practically, even assigning nothing for charities, a Canadian clergyman would *require* an income not less than is usually enjoyed by the clergy in England. It was the fashion with the enemies of the Church in England—till it was found that they had less,—to say that 300*l.* a-year was not “too much” for its ministers. On this point, however, we may quote the authority of Bishop Stewart himself, as respects the Canadian clergy:

“Although I would hope that the clergy of my diocese have learnt how to be abased and to suffer need for Christ’s sake, yet surely they ought not to be left to struggle with absolute poverty; and I have no hesitation in saying that a clergyman in Canada cannot maintain himself and his family with suitable respectability upon an income of less than 200*l.* a-year. This the greater part of the clergy have hitherto received;” and, added the bishop, “in reference to the withdrawal of the

annual grant, "there will be many cases of extreme hardship, if the salaries of tried and laborious servants are to be thus reduced in their declining years."

It may be added, that not one of the priests of the Church of Rome in Lower Canada has a less income than 200*l.*; so that on the whole Mr. Bettridge's estimate is far short of what might justly be urged on this country, as the claim of the Canadian Church. He has forborne his just demand for a *debt*, due from this nation to himself and his fellow-labourers, and to the colony whose best welfare they have engaged themselves in promoting.

Let it not be supposed, however, that, in speaking of the national sin of withdrawing public aid from the cause of religion in the colonies, we consider the interests of the Church to be ultimately dependent on any public measures. The demands which the Church has on the State, ought to be stated fairly, patiently, and to the last; it is the *privilege* of Christians to hope and believe all things. They know that there is one true religion, "one Catholic Apostolic Church," which has claims upon a nation, which cannot extend to any other religion, or to any variety of sect or denomination. Still, when states and governments are wavering in that which is alone their duty and their wisdom, private men are reminded the more of *individual* obligations; and considering the spiritual condition to which Canada has now been reduced, it would be madness to be much longer tampering with the willingness of the State, to perform what, after all, is in its true nature an office of the Church.

We have already given a few extracts from the correspondence of missionaries, manifesting that indication of religious want, which would be expected in settlers leaving the land in which they had imbibed their faith, and placed in a country where its worship and ordinances are no longer enjoyed. There are, it must be feared, numerous quarters altogether unheard of, where the name of Christian is by this time almost cast out; and others where the longing for religious privileges has given scope to the endeavours of perverted and schismatical teachers. The affections of mankind are such, that a *false* religion is far more acceptable to them than *none*. With respect to these schismatical agencies, we give the following extracts, leaving the reader, as before, to draw his own inference from them:

"There is a very new sect in that neighbourhood (North Gwillimbury on the shore of Lake Simcoe) called "the children of peace;" I had some conversation with Mr. ——— their leader, who behaved to me with great civility, and showed me his places of worship. One of them is a commodious building, in which the people assemble for the purposes of preaching and singing hymns. In this place is an organ, and other

musical instruments are also used. Common prayer forms no part of their public worship. Besides this meeting, they have erected another of considerable magnitude, which is built of wood, painted white and green, and ornamented with turrets and spires. Mr. ——— informed me that this edifice was seven years in building, but that the expense of erecting it is unknown. He said he could neither tell me the number of the children of peace, nor *state their particular tenets*"—(the reader will observe that he was their leader.) "He never preaches in this large building, but the people meet in it once a month, to join a sort of concert of music, and present their offerings of money."—*Stewart Missions*, p. 31.

"It is said that about one-half of the inhabitants of Uxbridge are Quakers, who are now divided into *two sects*. The rest of the people are of various persuasions, and some of them profess to belong to no particular denomination of Christians."—p. 39.

"It is apprehended that many persons in that neighbourhood (East Gwillimbury), who are now attached to the Church, will join other denominations if they remain destitute of her regular ministrations."—p. 58.

"Many of them (we read three months after) have run into the grossest errors, while others profess to be of *no particular persuasion*."—p. 63.

"In this township, (Marmora) *like most others in the province*, the members of the Church having so long been destitute of her ministrations, many of them have been compelled, as it were, to join other persuasions in search of that instruction *which they had no means of obtaining from their own*."

"The unfortunate settlers, (West Loughborough), being in a great measure, if not indeed wholly, destitute of sound religious instruction, are consequently literally tossed to and fro with every kind of doctrine that may chance to come in among them. Numbers were seduced and led away, about two years ago, by the cunningly devised fables and craftiness of certain designing men from the United States, calling themselves Mormonites, who pretended to have discovered a portion of Holy Scripture hitherto lost to the world, and which foretold that the second Advent of Christ would be in the Missouri territory, whither all who would be saved must immediately resort; and at the present time the township is infected with another set of heretics, under the denomination of 'Christians,' with whose peculiar tenets I have not yet had the opportunity of making myself acquainted; but from the little I could learn, they appear to *deny the doctrine of the Trinity, and to maintain the peccability of Christ's human nature*."—p. 112.

"The majority of the settlers in this part of the township (Marmora already referred to in a previous despatch), have joined the Methodist Society, *but have been originally Church people*."—p. 115.

"The number of Episcopalians settled through the (Midland) district far exceeded my expectations. I have had persons come not only ten miles, but no less than fifteen or twenty, and that in rainy weather, to attend service; but I may here observe that these persons, of whom I speak, were Europeans, *who have been brought up in the bosom of the Church; their children however can scarcely be expected to retain the same*

affection and attachment; indeed under existing circumstances it would be folly to look for it."—p. 123.

"At the close of the service (township of Missouri, London District,) a Mr. ———, an Irish emigrant, observed, 'We are but poor Church people, Sir, but we have no opportunity offered to us now of enjoying the ministration of our Church.'"—p. 176.

"I stopped (London District) at the house of an Irishman, who had been formerly a member of the Church, but in the absence of all her ministrations, had joined the Baptist connection."—p. 184.

"I perceive that many of those who are now connected with Dissenters have joined that connection from necessity; they were originally attached to the ordinances of the Church, and the same pious feeling which produced that attachment made them feel more deeply the entire absence of her religious ministrations, and led naturally to this result; but I would venture to assert, that many of them, if they could calculate with certainty upon the regular attendance of a clergyman, would soon return to their ancient fold."—p. 199.

"He told me that he had come from Pennsylvania nearly forty years back, and was then a member of the Church; but having not the remotest prospect of ever enjoying the services of clergymen of that Church here, he and his family had joined the Methodists."—p. 199.

"One person being invited to come and hear the Church minister, replied, 'What use is there for me to go and hear him read a sermon? I can do that for myself at home.'"—p. 202.

"I can ascribe the existing spirit of insubordination (February, 1838,) to one cause—the absolute lack of sound Scriptural education and faithful preaching. A large body of the disaffected are Universalists, whose teaching may be truly and briefly described—'blessed are they who die in their sins;' and whose practice in the various relations of life amply verifies this to be their doctrine. I believe nearly two-thirds of the prisoners at present confined in the gaol here are connected with this most unscriptural body. Not a few also of the Quakers of Norwich township have been suspected; and very many professed Baptists have been found in the ranks against the Queen *I know not of one member of the Church of England, nor have I heard of any, being detected in aiding or abetting this unnatural outbreak; but it can be alleged of some, who at home enjoyed the outward means of grace under her shadow, and yet since their settlement in this country, being deprived of any stated ministrations, have become totally indifferent to any and every form of Christian worship.*"—p. 248.

It is needless to multiply instances of what the acknowledged circumstances of the case must render inevitable, even were no details known in England, such as those which we have been quoting; it cannot but be, that where men's souls are thus left hungering and thirsting in vain, some will fall back into a heathen ignorance and "wretchlessness," others grasp every empty shadow of doctrine that is offered to their acceptance, and few indeed sit patiently as hermits and watchmen of the spiritual Jeru-

saalem, "thinking upon her stones, and pitying to see her in the dust." Bodies of sectarian professors engaged (as has become so grievously the case in this country) in active alienation from the Church, are already catching the stray sheep of the fold—perhaps the best minded and most zealous and affectionate of the once children of the Church—and have engaged them in their own schismatic connections; and it appears that their activity, and their outlay of funds, has been a source in many quarters of such success, that the ministers of the Church point to them as examples of a zeal, not equally manifested in the cause of truth. Something however for that cause is undoubtedly being done; and when it is considered what a sacred prerogative the clergy of the true Church carry with them in their Apostolic ordination, in the divine grace attending them as the ministers and stewards of the Christian Sacraments and ordinances, in the right which they have as men who have been "sent;" we cannot but be sure that their mere cursory trafficking backward and forward through the province, tells upon the hearts and convictions of multitudes, who would otherwise have been contented with the vacant messages of unordained instructors. Truly, the words are inspired, "*how shall they preach except they be sent?*"

It will easily be believed, that however in one sense unconsciously, there is an habitual disposition manifested among the Canadian settlers, to open their hearts towards the Apostolic prerogative of the genuine clergy; all classes and all characters of men, the ancient French settlers, the aboriginal Indians, the American royalists of 1783, German Protestants, English, Irish, Scotch emigrants, strangers from Pennsylvania, from New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, are all in one instance or another found gathering in consent towards the clergy, and the ordinances of the Episcopal Church; and if, when so little has been done, this is already the case, much room is there for future hope. We collect a few testimonies to the disposition thus manifested, from a manual which we have already so largely employed, on account of its containing some of the latest religious information from Canada.

"The inhabitants of this island (Long or Wolf Island, in the Midland District,) are, I believe, for the most part Methodists, but very many of them have never joined themselves to any particular denomination; and in the many visits I have been able to pay them, they have all evinced great satisfaction, and appeared extremely desirous of having the regular ministrations of the Church; indeed I feel persuaded, that, could even the occasional visits of a clergyman of the Church of England be secured to them, a numerous congregation might soon be formed, which, under the blessing of God, could not fail to be attended with the most beneficial results to the inhabitants in general." — *Stewart Mission*, p. 113."

“The places where he first began were in those congregations I had collected, and where I ministered occasionally; but he has added many to the number; and almost every time he returns here, it is with the tidings of fresh discoveries of scattered Church families, sufficient to constitute congregations of from twenty-five to forty souls in a place. I presume his congregations are small compared with those in other districts; but they are all likely to increase, both from the influx of settlers, and the increasing disposition of dissenters to attend his ministry.”—p. 152.

“I am not in the least surprised that so many members of our communion join themselves to dissenters of various denominations, despairing as they do of ever having a minister established in the remote settlements where they have purchased lands. It is my opinion, from what I have already observed since I came amongst them, that, were it possible to locate clergymen, devoted to the service of their Master, so that they could from different missionary stations visit these scattered sheep, and making their own residence the centre of their sphere of action, dissent would be little heard of here; the Church would in this country be established on as firm a basis in the hearts of the people, as ever it has been at home.”—p. 185.

“In some of their settlements (London District) many who had been a long time connected with dissenters, entirely owing to the want of means supplied by the Church, professed their willingness to return to her fold; and more than once was I assured *they never should have left it*, had they only been favoured with a clergyman to reside amongst them, on their first settlement in this country.”—p. 251.

“I am sure from my own experience, and the professions of the people, a resident clergyman could collect very large congregations of Church families; their present spiritual destitution leaves them most lamentably open to the pernicious and anti-christian doctrines, which are daily and actively disseminated by the busy agents of Satan.”—p. 252.

Such even now are the prospects obtained, from efforts hitherto made to convey the teaching and ordinances of the Church among the people of Upper Canada; and it need not be observed how inestimably important are the few years now passing, to the future state of that colony. If the ministers of that genuine Church, which is nominally established there, obtain free scope and efficiency of numbers, if, in effect, Apostolic Christianity becomes the domestic faith of the country, religious dissensions will gradually subside, and the wayward zeal of earnest but misled minds, will be gathered within a common channel, in which all will alike consent. On the other hand, if errors and heresies of creed, contending systems of church government, and rival partizans, are suffered to carry on their contest, till religious dissension arrives at that state of faction in which it visited this country two centuries ago, the occasion now offered will then be gone, and the hope of an uniform and peaceful feeling in the colony will have been lost through a guilty neutrality. It depends

on *present* exertions, whether a system of parochial ministration, a clergy intrusted with pastoral functions, and charged, as in England, with a local superintendence of the whole colony, should bear an influence of peace and truth, and of divine blessing, to the land.

If the question of "Establishment" is to depend on comparative numbers,—(a shifting, as well as vicious, criterion,)—instead of on the inherent truth of one religion over every variation of departure from it, then dissension will become fixed as a sort of perpetual heritage upon the province. We forbear, however, from urging the mere *consequences* of an act in itself criminal and godless.

It is probably on account of its connection with the future religious establishment of the province, more than from its value as an endowment, that the interest of Churchmen has been much engaged towards the well-known question of the "Clergy reserves." At the period of the separation of the province of Quebec into Upper and Lower Canada (1791), a measure was introduced for securing the interests of the Established Church by reserves of one-seventh of uninclosed lands in the Upper Province. At that time the inhabitants were only 10,000 or 12,000; but as the population was already on the increase, Mr. Pitt, who introduced that measure, looked forward to such a progress in improvement and cultivation, as should render the reserved lands available for the incomes of the clergy. It is probable, that if there had been means in the colony, he would have followed the example of the French legislature, whose endowments to the clergy of the Lower Province have an appearance of much more consideration, and were attended with better success. Richelieu, from whom the charter of the French colonizers of Canada was obtained, included in it an engagement for the appointment of three priests in each district, whose stipend for fourteen years was to be paid in money, and after that period in opened lands fitted for immediate cultivation. No such *antecedent* provision was made for the Protestant clergy by the legislature of England; unopened lands were left for them, as a barren provision,—which indeed might at that time be almost obtained for nothing, and which to the clergy would be peculiarly valueless, inasmuch as (individually) they are not permanent landlords, and would consequently be expending large sums in reclaiming the land, with no prospect of receiving perhaps any income. In a speech of Mr. Pakington's, printed in the St. James's Chronicle for August 4, 1838, it is stated that the charge of reclaiming waste land in Upper Canada is *3l.* per acre; and that this great *immediate* expense almost precludes its being *underlet* on any terms; for a few shillings more than the

expense of clearing, the fee-simple might be bought. Meantime, as the clergy reserves had remained for many years uncultivated, it was found necessary by the government, in 1827, to introduce some measure with respect to them; but, instead of any steps for rendering them available as property of the Church, by placing the Protestant clergy on the same footing as the clergy of the Church of Rome in the other province under the government of France; the more convenient, but not very generous, course was taken of selling the clergy reserves, and leaving to the Church the mere income which the proceeds should yield. About 70,000*l.* is the amount actually obtained from the partial sale of these lands, up to the present time; and the interest is scarcely more than 2000*l.* per annum; the whole of which has been *hitherto* employed, as it arose, in making provision for the Protestant clergy. For thirty years from the time of the appropriation of the reserves, no question arose as to the intention of the act which assigned them; but in 1818 the Scotch Church claimed a portion of them, as being in the eye of the law a "Protestant clergy;" the *legal* sense of the term admits, it would seem, of this ambiguity; and *legally*, therefore, the government can thus far alienate any portion of that property. We do not know whether they think themselves, in equity and conscience, justified in such an act; but if so, the Church is touching on its last stage of forbearing dependence upon the mere political system of the country; a dependence which it has been natural to it to exercise, and which already it has been found tardy to relinquish. Meantime it is surely due to their sacred cause, that they whose interests are affected by the question of the reserves, should have no hand in any compromise, by which Church property will be sacrilegiously taken from its owner; let them take *patiently* the spoiling of their goods, but beware of *consenting in the sin*.

We have now cursorily laid before the reader the general bearings of a question, which is beginning to excite interest in numerous quarters; instead of further pursuing the subject in its *political* bearing, we gladly turn to the inquiry,—what steps seem the first that suggest themselves, what practical results are to be come to, in order to meet, as far as in the members of the Church lies, that demand which the spiritual condition of Canada so impressively suggests?

In the first place, with regard to the appropriation of funds designed to meet the urgent exigencies which have been alluded to, it seems important that *some specific channel* should be provided, to convey contributions individually intended for such a cause as that of the Church in Canada. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel forms a collective fund for the colo-

nies at large, any interference with which might restrict the general principle on which its income is appropriated; and consequently we believe it scarcely ever occurs, that that society becomes the depositary of contributions conveyed to it for any *single* specified object. Might not, however, such a case as the present demands of the Church in Canada be considered sufficiently urgent to admit of *a specific fund* being opened in that society? Such a change in its system would not be a departure from the true principles of the Church, which rather catches every impulse of charity in its members, gathering the varied streams of bounty into a common channel; not leaving them to find their own outflow, as we fear is too much the case in the present instance. If there were a branch opened "for Canadian designs," in the Society for Propagating the Gospel, those two or three funds which now exist would no doubt be appropriated to that channel; by this means the evil of multiplying societies, not to mention possible jealousies, would be entirely avoided; while the Society for Propagating the Gospel would lose nothing of its genuine character, as a fund for transmitting to the bishops in the colonies contributions offered in this land for the aid of the Churches which they rule. It deserves to be considered how many interested feelings would be enlisted in the cause, by appropriating contributions in the way supposed; there must be many persons in the middle classes in England who have relatives in Canada; thousands who have connections, such as fellow-parishioners or fellow-labourers, landlords, clergy, owners of manufactories, who have been instrumental to emigration, and are now anxious for the welfare of families settled in the colonies; all these are at present in want of some direct and well-established channel for the truest instance they can exercise of their natural kindness and sympathy; it is due that the Church should afford to so legitimate a feeling, the means which will ensure its freest exercise. Besides this, it seems just to those who promote designs of Christian benevolence, to leave to them the privilege of selecting the channels to which their bounties are contributed; the cause of education, as for instance Bishop's College at Calcutta (where we believe the plan now recommended was successfully tried); the amelioration of the penal settlements; the larger endowment of bishoprics or rectories; the establishment again of new missions; the specific object of erecting Churches; or the supply of occasional instances of spiritual destitution, such as that of the new emigrants in Canada; are objects which will variously engage the interest of various minds, and among which it would be well that each should choose its task. The tendency of thus opening different departments for

missionary purposes, will be to render the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel *the only organ of the Church of England for the aid of Missions*; this, it may be trusted, will in time be the case; but the reader is referred to "A Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury," clearly and satisfactorily entering into this subject, which is mentioned at the head of this Review.

In the next place, with respect to the present condition of the Church in Canada, the first impression which it suggests is, undoubtedly, one of anxiety that the *number* of the Clergy should be largely increased; wide spheres of duty in every direction unoccupied, several rectors within the last few years deceased, and in consequence of Lord Grey's measure their cures *to this day unsupplied*, and 100,000 members of the Church destitute of spiritual instruction,* are causes not only for regret but shame, that the Church of Christ should in any land be thus branchless and trodden down; but yet it may be a question, whether the multiplying of missionaries be the most direct, or at least the most effective step that can be taken. It should rather be thought that something more substantial than discursive labours among the settlers is the one great task to be gained; to secure, namely to religion, not only occasional ministers through the country, but a central home from which its influence will in the first instance be expanded; a heart, from whence the circulation will more freely flow. It is a cause of thankfulness that Upper Canada has indeed the superintendence of a bishop, which is the first security for the stability and building up of religion in a land. The whole history of the Christian faith enjoins that tone of settling and establishing religion, which the fixed superintendence of one ruler will secure; from the first hours of the faith bishops have been the true missionaries of the Church; *they* were its preachers before the other orders were assigned to aid them. Of late years, on the other hand, when a new country is evangelized, the youngest ministers, generally without any spiritual superior, are the first messengers of the Gospel; and as they are thus sent on a humanly-chosen plan (and it must be feared in a niggard temper), though individual zeal has many times been rewarded, their cause on the whole has but little prospered. It is not, however, the office and presence only of a bishop, that feeds and vitalizes the spiritual system; the adjuncts, doubtless, of his office, the kind of attendance by which it is signified, the aids of learning, the constant and solemn worship of God in a worthy house, are the true means of giving to religion, at its first visit to nations, not majesty only but strength. In these times such

* See Mr. Beltridg's petition, printed in the British Magazine for September, 1838.

means of promoting Christianity are often considered trivial and idle; perhaps some persons will presumptuously call them unscriptural and superstitious; but then, on the other hand, those plans which conform to the modern temper have been tried, and have failed; failed in comparison with the missionary successes of the primitive Church; and it is therefore not unjustifiable to entreat that the former means should be returned to, not only on the ground of *their* having been successful, but because all besides them have been to a great extent useless. It is said by Stillingfleet, that in old times, when the Gospel was sent to any country, its ministers were *a bishop with his clergy*; and the first employment of their funds was *to build a Cathedral*. Were only the temper recovered that would act thus, there would be a good hope of converting nations and empires again to one Catholic and united faith; we should hear of kings and emperors bowing once more before the Church's altar, or savages who, unknowing pen and ink, "have the word of life written within their hearts." Looking, therefore, to an ancient and well-founded principle in missions, the course seems suggested of aiming at a system inverting that which is at present more popular, namely, fixing a central seat for a bishop; endowing his office with a large present income, so that he may be a trustee of the Church's wealth; erecting a worthy cathedral like those of this land, built when England was perhaps almost as poor as Canada is now; and supplying means for an attendance of clergy around him, as his council, and as deputies at the same time for actual duties.

At present the position of the only Bishop in Canada is the following; he has a diocese of 1800 miles, an income of £1000 a-year; no Cathedral Church at Toronto, (the supposed episcopal city of Upper Canada,) and instead of the attendance of other clergy as a council to assist him, he is *himself both a rector and archdeacon*. Those offices he held before he was a bishop, and he now retains them in order to eke out the utterly inadequate revenue to which the see has been reduced, (it was previously to 1837, £3000 a-year,) and likewise because, if he vacated them, the same government measure by which the revenues of his see were reduced, will place a period to any further stipends being assigned for those appointments. How contrasted is the recent mission of a diplomatic agent to the same country, with his splendid retinue and gorgeous income, with that true minister of peace, the bearer to Canada of permanent and effectual blessings, but cramped and weakened, through the caprice of a government, in his beneficent and holy functions.

The same principle on which it is suggested to give a kind of central dignity and eminence to religion, by the endowment of a

bishopric, and the erection of a cathedral, guides to the establishment, not so much of systematic education through the colony, but more immediately of some institution in the episcopal city, for the education of the clergy and others, and still more for the permanent maintenance of a body of learned men, after the manner of the endowed colleges in this country. It is understood that many of the cathedral chapters in England are likely to form institutions of this description; but their value in a remote colony will be obviously greater, and their position will indeed be in many ways altogether different. In England the Universities will continue to give the tone to the theology of the country; cathedral education will only be adding to stores which were before large though inadequate; and if any material change is made, it will be perhaps a stricter and more ascetic tone of education, through greater closeness of superintendence; and the admission of a poorer class of students, to whom, in the great increase of the population, it would seem desirable to provide admission into the Church. Erected on the other hand in a colony, where few establishments for education exist, and none for the education of the clergy, such an institution would be a fountain of wealth to the cause of religion, not a little contrasted with the chance movements of a few travelling missionaries, hurrying from month to month through successive districts. The Roman Church in Canada has had colleges of this description, (still we believe in full vigour and activity,) for more than a century; so indeed have they had a cathedral and an episcopal palace; and it would be well if Protestants would consider how successful in proselytizing that Church has always been, from the days of Augustine in England, to the present day; and how firmly on the whole it retains the affection and dependence of its followers. When, after some delay, a Roman Catholic bishop was sent from England to Quebec, the first from this country after Canada became the property of England (there was then no Protestant bishop in Upper Canada), it is on record that the joy of the inhabitants was so great, that they expressed it in almost a public way, meeting each other with congratulations in every street, and saying "God has remembered us! Thank God, we have a bishop!" We know not why a false and perverted faith should be the only channel of feelings in themselves so Catholic and pure; feelings of which many testimonies might indeed be found, before the errors of the Romish faith had mixed in the pure channel of traditional truth. It is the *theory* of the Church of England, to revert to that ecclesiastical state in which the Catholic Church was, before the errors of Romanism had entered within it; but it seems as if men were caring more to be Protestants than Churchmen; and

while avoiding the errors of Rome had forgotten great Catholic principles, both of doctrine and polity. Hence there has been so little that is calm and measured in the missionary undertakings of the present day; if any thing was to be done, no intervening steps, no looking to system has been brooked; and the reward has followed, that affection to the Catholic Church, as a system, has never been fully realized among Protestant converts; we have shamefully left it to Romanists to exclaim, "*God has remembered us, thank God we have a bishop!*"

It is observable, that the principle now suggested in missions, of large bounty upon few objects, is not in the present day pursued by the *Church of Rome* alone; the *dissenting connections* in Canada are mentioned in a letter of a missionary there as following the same kind of plan in the distribution of their funds; and for a reason which would be surely far more stringent, in the instance of Church of England missions, namely, that if once the reliance and affection of the people were secured, and they felt those great blessings entrusted to them, they would be as little dependent upon foreign contributions as the Church of England is now; and funds which on the usual principle would be doled out from year to year for another half century, might soon be available for carrying onward with increase the Christian faith, into needier and more distant countries. If the Church in Canada had possessed more the character of a corporation, if the bishop had had an adequate income, and the ecclesiastical endowments had been in the first instance available in some measure for its general purposes, the landed property of the Church would have been at this time as productive as that of any secular landlord; but this is the least and lowest instance of the benefits which would have followed if it had been remembered, that the Church is an apostolic institution, which can lose no part of the integrity of its system, can omit no well-established precedent, and neglect no salutary maxim, without detriment to the efficacy and permanency of the blessings which it otherwise dispenses. "*With the froward thou wilt learn frowardness.*"

ART. VII.—*Memoirs of the Life of Sir Walter Scott, Bart.*
7 vols. Murray and Whittaker, London: Cadell, Edinburgh.
1838.

SOME one has observed, how sad and unsatisfactory, generally speaking, are the recorded lives of great poets. But it may be doubted whether the observation be fairly drawn from a view of the very highest specimens of the art. The great examples of misery in that kind have commonly been in literary rank about the level of Chatterton or Savage. And Mr. Wordsworth avowedly meant it for a representation of an untrue notion, indicating a fanciful as well as an unhealthy mood of mind, when he averred that

“ We poets in our youth begin in gladness,
But thereof comes in the end despondency and madness.”

But though it be not at all necessary that the career of a first-rate poet should be full of discomfort, it might perhaps be true to say that it has almost always proved very full of mystery. Which of our lives, indeed, is not so? since it is a secret expressly reserved: “ Thou, Thou alone knowest the hearts of the children of men.” Positively as we all speak of one another, we all know by our own experience how impossible it would be for any one to trace the actual springs of our own conduct, the circumstances which truly and really made us what we are, without information which ourselves only can give. We know how large a portion we have forgotten of our own outward behaviour, much more of our wishes and emotions; nay, how little we knew of them at the time, even on those occasions which were the turning points of our life. We know all this, and yet we go on coolly discussing and analyzing the living and the dead, as if we had them subjected to some unfailing chemical apparatus.

One of the great merits of the interesting life before us is the biographer's strong impression on this delicate point.

“ I regard,” says he, “ with small respect, any attempt to delineate fully and exactly any human being's character. I distrust, even in very humble cases, our capacity for judging our neighbour fairly; and I cannot but pity the presumption that must swell in the heart and brain of any ordinary brother of the race, when he dares to pronounce, *ex cathedra*, on the whole structure and complexion of a great mind, from the comparatively narrow and scanty materials which can by possibility have been placed before him.”

Now if this remark hold in respect of the statesman and general, and those whose proceedings would seem to stand out in

full light, much more concerning the poet, whose character as such begins and ends, for the most part, within his own bosom.

“The difficulty, to my view,” Mr. Lockhart proceeds, “is not lessened,—perhaps it is rather increased,—when the great man is also a great artist. It is true that many of the feelings common to our nature can only be expressed adequately, and that some of the finest of them can only be expressed at all in the language of art, and more especially in the language of poetry. But it is equally true, that high and sane art never attempts to express that for which the artist does not claim and expect general sympathy;” (is not this rather too broadly stated?) “and however much of what we had thought to be our own secrets he ventures to give shape to, it becomes, I can never help believing, modest understandings to rest convinced that there remained a world of deeper mysteries, to which the dignity of genius would refuse any utterance.”—vol. vii. pp. 397, 398.

The biography, therefore, of a poet worthy of the name, even his unconscious auto-biography (which latter description would seem to apply most properly to the greater part of the present publication), may be an instructive and curious, but must ever be an imperfect lesson. And this, over and above any difficulty in obtaining materials, and ascertaining the positive facts of a life not commonly spent before the public.

Whatever be the cause, the effect appears undeniable; that we shall generally look in vain for satisfactory lives of the poets of the highest order; such lives as may furnish a real account, not merely an ingenious conjectural solution, of the chief facts in their history—their works.

Of Homer, *e. g.* who can affirm any thing positive beyond the simple matters in the fragment preserved by Thucydides: that he was blind, that he resided in Chios, that he exercised the profession of *ἀοιδός*, and in that character went occasionally (among other places) to Delos? Of Æschylus we can hardly be said to know more facts, but those which are preserved to us are more important: they are the critical points of his life; that he served actively as a soldier, that he fought at Salamis; that he invented additions of no small moment to the mechanical and scenical part of tragedy; that finding himself eclipsed by Sophocles, he retired, in his old age, from Athens to Sicily; lastly, and perhaps one may say chiefly (with regard to his cast of poetry), that he was a disciple of the Pythagorean school. The histories of Pindar, Lucretius, Virgil, Spenser, Shakespeare, so much of them as is certainly known, might be related in as few and as brief sentences as these. For the rest, we are left to make out from their works what their tastes and pursuits were; an investigation sure to be tinged more or less with the peculiar views of the person carrying

it on, and to be warped, more or less unconsciously, in support of any theory of poetry in general, or of *their* poetry in particular, which he may happen to entertain.

It is obvious how greatly this deficiency of evidence regarding the chief masters of an art must embrace the difficulty of coming to right conclusions concerning the nature and essence of the art itself. It is as if a chemist had lost the record of the experiments on which he had been prepared to ground some great discovery; or as if a financier had mislaid the document containing his figures. Till such loss be replaced, there may be plenty of ingenious conjecture, but no data to be thoroughly depended on. So far as poetry is a development of certain qualities in the human mind and heart, and not merely a work of art or a branch of literature; so far, it may be truly said, that all our speculations concerning it are stopped *in limine*, if we are denied the knowledge of the history and education of the minds from whom it proceeded.

So much the more are we indebted to the volumes before us, for the ample and complete picture which they exhibit of the education of one great poet at least. For in that character, surely, as his leading one, posterity will always consider Sir Walter Scott. His romances in prose are essentially poems, whatever test we take of poetry, except that ordinary one of metre; indeed it would not, perhaps, be easy to find a completer proof of metrical composition being but an accident of the art, than any one may make out for himself, by recollecting what he felt on first reading the *Lady of the Lake*, and how little the impression differed from that left by the *Talisman*, or *Guy Mannerling*. The kind of interest, the objects of sympathy, are surely the same in both cases: the difference of prose and verse is felt to be but technical; it is the same or similar music performed on different instruments. Thus it may be fairly said that his poetical remains amount to at least sixty volumes, a fertility unsurpassed even by what we read of Lopez de Vega; a mass of composition which, taken along with the very minute detail of his life preserved in these volumes, supplies, perhaps, the completest set of materials for speculation on the poetical character, which the world has yet inherited from the stores of any one writer.

This is the particular point of view in which it is now proposed to consider this very full and interesting memoir of one of the most interesting of those whom mankind have agreed to admire; a memoir which altogether does the greatest credit to the compiler, in respect both of good and manly feeling exercised on a great variety of very trying and delicate subjects, and also of skill and good taste as a biographer, such as we believe to have been rarely exceeded; the rule observed throughout being that which

of old was so highly praised in Homer, to permit the subject of the memoir to speak as much as possible for himself. To be sure, there was a great facility in doing so in this instance, beyond what most other writers of personal history have enjoyed; Sir Walter having been all his life a most fluent and punctual correspondent, and pouring himself out in his familiar letters in that kind of mixed tone, between sport and seriousness, between private and general topics, which at the same time by its engaging qualities ensures the preservation of letters, and by and by with least impropriety admits of publication, and best rewards it. And to complete the interest of the collection, it so happens that we have his own account of himself, in his own words, for just those two periods of his life, in regard of which we should most wish for such a document; we have his recollections of his childhood, and his diary when in declining health, and in the very severest of his trials. Thus we have his own confessions, so to speak, exactly where it was least possible for others to speak for him. And if there be any special relation between a man's general character and his character as a poet, undoubtedly such a life as this, so abundantly yet so undesignedly disclosed, and combined with such a store of original writings, cannot but offer large scope for ascertaining and exemplifying such relation.

To a question of this kind, then, it is proposed principally to direct attention in the following remarks. We shall try, by comparing this memoir of Sir Walter Scott with his poetical remains, to solve the main phenomena of the latter; not without a certain misgiving of mind, as if there were more or less impropriety in submitting to any thing like critical analysis the memory of so noble a character and so great a writer. One is painfully reminded as one writes, of the well known complaint,

“Our meddling intellect
Mis-shapes the beauteous forms of things—
We murder, to dissect.”

One feels that the proper application after all of the record of such a life as this, is to something still higher than poetry or poetical criticism. Nevertheless the attempt must be made, with an endeavour to preserve throughout the respectful tone which becomes men speaking of their superiors over their graves newly closed; and not without hope that it may issue in something conducive to those higher interests, to which all poetry and all literature, to be worth cultivating at all, must eventually do suit and service.

The idea then of poetry in the abstract, which it is conceived admits of especial illustration and support from the comparison of the works of Sir Walter Scott with his life, is something like what follows. *Poetry is the indirect expression in words, most ap-*

appropriately in metrical words, of some overpowering emotion, or ruling taste, or feeling, the direct indulgence whereof is somehow repressed. This notion, to bring it fully out, would require more explanation and development than the limits of the present paper will allow. It is proposed in this formal and positive shape, as a definition, for perspicuity's sake, not from any clear conviction that it is a sufficient account; but it is believed to be true as far as it goes, and to be worth proposing by way of conjecture, were it only for the chance of affording a clue to more fortunate or more sagacious inquiries. With this preface we proceed to offer a few considerations in support of this idea of Poetry.

And first of all, that there is *some* central idea of it, towards which the various definitions or descriptions of great men in several ages, and also the ordinary and popular notions, converge; this seems implied by the manner in which the word itself, and still more the adjective "poetical," are continually used both in books and in the conversation of educated people. We hear it said from time to time, such and such a remark was quite "poetical;" such and such a character, or landscape, or effect of light and shade, upon clouds, suppose, or on water, was "just what a poet would rejoice in;" particular usages or expressions of uneducated men are said to have more or less of unconscious "poetry" in them; and races, families, individuals, schools of policy, philosophy, or morals, nay, and sects in religion too, are said to differ from one another as being some more some less "poetical." Thus it would be generally agreed on, we suppose, that the Spaniards, as a nation, have more poetry in them than the French; that the views of Plato and Pythagoras were more likely to approve themselves to a poetical mind than those of Aristotle or Epicurus; that the Scandinavian mythology was more poetical than those of ancient Egypt, or of India; that mountainous districts are more favourable to the poetical temper than unvaried plains, the habits of the country than those of the town, of an agricultural than of a commercial population.

Again, it is no unusual remark, when people are talking of little children, their sports and sayings and other indications of temperament, this or that trait was "truly poetical;" this or that child has more "poetry" about him than the other. Nay, the same sort of thing may be and is not unfrequently observed, even in such slight matters as the fitting up of a room, the laying out of the nooks and glades of a garden, or the disposition of a flower bed, whether by educated persons or uneducated.

Again, in the kindred arts, there is something which men commonly agree to designate as Poetry; of course as being more or less analogous to poetry, properly so called, whatever that may

be; the poetry of painting, of sculpture, of architecture, of music, is an expression only generally recognised among those who are judges in such matters. The pictures, e. g. of Raffaele are felt to have more poetry in them than those of Rubens; the Grecian architecture is more poetical than the Roman, and the Gothic more so, perhaps, than either; and sometimes the art of sculpture itself is compared with that of painting, and decided to be the more poetical of the two. And to conclude with an example from the highest subject of all; is it not a reproach frequently cast upon the orthodox and Catholic side in theological debate, that the sincerest among them are led, not by reason, but by feelings akin to poetical ones; and on the other hand, is there not an instinct which causes the youthful and ardent mind to shrink from utilitarian or rationalistic error, previous to accurate examination, as being essentially cold and unpoetical?

The question then arises, What all these things have in common, which should cause them thus to be represented by a common term, and that term appropriate, in the first instance, to a distinct branch of art? Such common quality, could it be ascertained, would evidently throw no small light on the nature of the art whose name it bears; it would clearly indicate that circumstance in the art which, according to the general feeling of mankind, is most characteristic of it. In searching for it, it seems natural first to turn one's attention to those theories of poetry, which the great masters of reason have sanctioned at various times. Aristotle, as is well known, considered the essence of Poetry to be *Imitation*, or rather, perhaps, one should say, *Expression by metrical words*. *Expression* we say, rather than *imitation*; for the latter word clearly conveys a cold and inadequate notion of the writer's meaning, and is quite inapplicable to musical composition, which however he himself produces as affording obvious illustrations of the view which he was taking.

Will it then be a sufficient account of "the poetical" in the kindred arts, or in common life, to say that it is applied to those traits, or details, or accidents, which strike us as more "expressive" than ordinary? It will be true, perhaps, as far as it goes, but one should still desire some specification of what is meant by "expression." Now would it not be found, that when people use that term, they commonly mean something like this—that the direct enunciation of a fact or feeling is impeded, and the mind, full of that fact or feeling, finds out for itself indirect ways of conveying it to others? Thus the living countenance, voice, or figure, is more or less *expressive* as it answers more or less exactly to the *changes* which take place in the mental habit or emotion. If settled in any one cast of feature, one tone, or one attitude, so

as to appear incapable of any other, we do not call it simply "expressive," however strongly the particular feeling may have stamped it. What obtains for it that denomination is its aptitude to obey the mind, and to reflect every passing shade from within. Why is this, and why is it thought much of, but because of the extreme *difficulty* of expounding to another in any satisfactory way the history but of a single moment in one's heart, much more its conflicts and changes? That face, that voice, that form is most *expressive*, which best serves the purpose of relieving men's instinctive wish to communicate, perhaps for the chance of engaging sympathy, these otherwise indescribable variations of thought and feeling. Are not the same likewise the most *poetical*?

So again (a topic before touched on), when we are comparing one with another the sports and fancies and playful imitations of children, every one must have observed how greatly they differ in this quality of Expression, or fulness of meaning; some being merely imitative, just enacting the gestures of their playmates, and echoing their words, while others, on the contrary, abound in quaint inventions of their own. And among these latter again may be observed a further and a very remarkable difference, according as any one particular thread of meaning is found to run more or less entirely through all their little sallies of thought or imagination. Some are more versatile, some more enthusiastic; some ready with whimsical resources to embody whatever fancy comes uppermost, others, as it may seem, ever on the watch to find ways of shadowing out, whether in words or in actions, some one particular group of fancies which has become dominant in their own minds. It is this latter class among children, if we mistake not, to which primarily and principally the title of "poetical" is attached; and the observation, duly followed up, may prove to be of no small service in guiding us to right notions of Poetry in the abstract. For example, (the reader will excuse the insignificance of the illustration should it really answer its purpose as an illustration), a child of seven or eight years old was heard to describe herself and her sister as follows: "Mary and I would each of us like to be a bird, for Mary would like to *fly*, and I should like to *make a nest*." Every one probably would allow at once that there was something very poetical in this little flight of imagination. Why, but because it contrives to express, not directly, but by way of association and allusion, that which one should have thought far beyond the expressive powers of a child of that age. It gives a sort of sketch of her own and her sister's character, a brief history of both their minds. Now, if on coming to know more of the same two children, one perceived, as doubtless one should perceive, the contrast which one of them thus hit

off running like two distinctive threads through the whole course of their little imaginative efforts, their ways of telling stories, their inventions in play, their remarks or speculations, whether serious or sportive, on striking objects in nature or art as they became acquainted with them : many, we suppose, at least among those who condescend to notice such things, would say, there was a good deal of "poetry" in the general character of such children; and the name in that case would clearly be applied to the instinctive skill with which they severally realized, in matters of themselves remote from all such associations, the visions which they delighted in respectively, of soaring or repose.

Without departing from the same illustration, we may carry the argument one step further. Suppose the same children grown up; of course the tastes which they thus expressed in childhood will be exercised and developed all their lives through; but such exercise and development will no longer be thought to give their characters a "poetical" air, except where being more or less impeded by outward circumstances or feelings of reserve, they find means to vent themselves indirectly, and covertly to engage the sympathies of those who understand them, by aid of associations often accidental, and subtle to any degree of refinement. The quiet and domestic character will be recognized as poetical, when, being cast upon the turmoil of busy life, it betrays itself to be forever contriving imaginary escapes and little images of the repose for which it longs: the animated and soaring temper in like manner, when untoward circumstances keep it still and in the shade, and it manages to relieve itself by the same sort of indirect exercise. The former will sympathize with those who in a great city cherish in secret the remembrance of their native mountains:

"Bright volumes of vapour through Lothbury glide,
And a river flows on down the vale of Cheapside :"—

the latter, with the inland boy, who longs to be at sea, and assuages his longing, as Nelson is reported to have done, with every sort of sport or enterprise that may best remind him of maritime scenes and hazards. In both cases it is the *difficulty*, and the way of overcoming it, which marks the character as poetical.

So again, in respect of those cases in ordinary life, the life, we mean, of uneducated people, which are generally confest to raise their thoughts and language, perhaps, we might still more justly add, their behaviour, to something deserving that epithet: they are such as violent bodily pain; the death or burial of a dear friend; intense hope and fear, or bitter disappointment in some matter of personal affection; exile, or any thing approaching to it, as violent removal from their own home, especially if it be an hereditary home. It is the commonest possible remark that, on these and

similar occasions, even the coldest and rudest minds express and behave themselves, comparatively, in a poetical way.

And the fact seems to be sufficiently accounted for, if we suppose the poetry to consist in the indirect expression of overpowering, but impeded feelings: impeded in their direct exhibition, as in these cases no doubt they are, partly by their very strength and intenseness, which renders it impossible at once to give them vent; and partly, in almost all minds, by an instinctive delicacy which recoils from exposing them openly, as feeling that they never can meet with full sympathy.

Reverting for a moment to some of the other instances above alluded to of the conversational use of the words *poetry* and *poetical*, let us see if they can be explained without violence on the hypothesis offered. Certain landscapes, it was observed—certain combinations of the colours and forms of nature—strike the intelligent observer as poetical, he can hardly tell how or why. “There is a great deal of *thought* in that sky:” “that effect of light and shade *looks as if it would do for a simile*:”—these are the kind of sayings which drop from lovers of scenery, and when we hear them, we may recognize their aptness and truth, without any idea of a particular train of thought, or object of comparison, having been in the speaker’s mind. It is enough that we feel by an instinct, no matter how attained, that there is *some* leading idea, some *moral* in what we see, could we anyhow discern it. We feel that it answers, and tends to express, and by expression to soothe or develope, as the case may be, *some* state more or less complicated of human thought or feeling; that persons so affected would enter into the scene before us, and welcome and adopt it as more congenial to them than any words. When we feel this, and call such sights (or sounds) poetical, do we not so far countenance the notion, that where there is indirect expression of any engrossing mood of mind, there is Poetry, though without rhyme, metre, or words?

If from nature we pass to art, and consider (*e. g.*) what such a writer as Sir J. Reynolds meant by the “poetry” of painting or sculpture; we find him denying that quality to Rubens, and ascribing it to the great masters of the Roman school, and in an especial degree to Giulio Romano. “Rubens,”* he affirms, “never possessed *poetical conception of character*. In his representation of the highest characters in the Christian or fabulous world, instead of something above humanity, which might fill the idea which is conceived of such beings, the spectator finds little more than mere mortals, such as he meets with every day.” At the

* Works, edit. 1824, vol. ii. p. 300.

same time, Sir Joshua places Rubens “in the first rank of illustrious painters,” not on account of “any particular expression,” but of the “general effect, the genius, which pervades and illuminates the whole.” He ascribes to his works the quality of making the spectator “feel a degree of that enthusiasm with which the painter was carried away;” and says, that he “possessed an originality of manner by which he may be truly said to have extended the limits of the art.”* So distinct, in the judgment of this great critic and artist, was the peculiar praise of Painting as an art from that which may be called “poetical” in it. In what he conceived this latter to consist, may be seen in his opinion of the Roman and Bolognese masters. Giulio Romano, according to him,† possessed “the true poetical genius of painting, perhaps in a higher degree than any other painter whatever.” Now, Giulio’s manner is thus described by Du Fresnoy,‡ in whose sentiments Reynolds has expressed his concurrence:—“He was a great imitator of the ancients, giving a clear testimony in all his productions, that he was desirous to restore to practice the very forms and fabrics which were ancient;” yet “his manner was drier and harder than any of Raffaele’s school; he did not exactly understand either light or shadow, or colouring; he is frequently harsh and ungraceful.” Again, in comparing Raffaele with Michael Angelo, Reynolds says,§ “The latter has more of *the poetical inspiration* . . . his people are a superior order of beings . . . Raffaele’s imagination is not so elevated; his figures are not so much disjoined from our own diminutive race of beings.” Yet, to his works, the Cartoons especially, we are elsewhere|| referred for choice examples, “how much the great style exacts from its professors to conceive and represent their subjects *in a poetical manner*.” Again (and this bears on another comparison above-mentioned, that of sculpture with painting :) “What artist,”¶ we are asked, “ever looked at the Torso without feeling a warmth of enthusiasm, as from the highest efforts of poetry?” Let such incidental notices as these be compared with the more definite account which the same writer gives in another place** of the poetical art:—“Its object, in common with painting, is to accommodate itself to all the natural propensities and inclinations of the mind. The very existence of poetry depends on the licence it assumes of deviating from actual nature, in order to gratify natural propensities by other means, which are found by experience full as capable of affording such gratification.” What is this but saying that the “poetry” of art lies

* Works, edit. 1824, vol. ii. pp. 296—298.

† Vol. iii. p. 152.

‡ Ibid. 176.

§ Vol. i. p. 101.

|| Ibid. p. 67.

¶ Vol. ii. p. 15.

** Page 93.

in its tendency to relieve certain longings of our nature after perfection in this or that kind? that the several schools, and models in each school, are more poetical one than another, as their several objects are more engrossing, more completely such as to fill the whole mind, and less attainable in any direct way? Thus the Roman school excels the Venetian and Flemish, because the beauty of design and form is higher and rarer, and, when truly felt, more enamouring to the imagination, than the beauty of colour and mere composition: Michael Angelo was more of a poet even than Raffaele, because,* “knowing that his hand could execute whatever his fancy could suggest,” he permitted himself to be quite carried away by the grandeur of his conceptions, while Raffaele was continually chastening his by a kind of Virgilian purity, judgment, and correctness: Rubens, on the contrary, who was equally great in many departments, whose enthusiasm was that of his art, not of his subject, is pronounced to have been wholly deficient in poetical conception: and, to conclude, if Sculpture be sometimes accounted nearer akin to Poetry than Painting is, Sir J. Reynolds may seem to have explained this, where he says† that sculpture, from the nature of its material, can have relation to but one kind of painting, and *that* the highest and most poetical. From its very want of colouring, and the general scantiness of its means, it gives one, more than painting does, the notion of a full mind, struggling to express, with inadequate materials, some idea with which it labours.

A difficulty suggests itself on this head, of which it may be as well to take notice. Reynolds, evidently following Bacon,‡ supposes that there is some one high class of objects, the highest and most ideal of all, to the development of which poetry, properly so called, is confined; whereas our theory would extend it to all subjects, which can any how take entire hold of the imagination, and cause it to seek relief by indirect expression. The answer has already been hinted at, but may as well be stated here a little more formally. If poetry be what we have supposed, though its field will of course be as extensive as the tastes and passions of mankind, yet the need of it and its peculiar power will be more evident as it is employed on loftier objects, and such as lie further beyond our direct attainment; whose attractive force also is more complete, so that having once entered in they quickly possess the whole mind, and form henceforth its point of sight, causing it to view all things in relation to themselves. Thus antique subjects, *ceteris paribus*, are more poetical than

* Reynolds, vol. ii. p. 149.

† Ibid. p. 12.

‡ Works, vol. i. p. 90, edit. 1803; Adv. of Learning, b. ii.

modern, as being more out of reach: Achilles more so than Æneas, were it only from his mysterious and supernatural air, which renders it so much harder for his admirers to realize him. Thus also the old Platonic notion of ideas, elevating all things, both in history and in nature, into a sort of tokens of a higher world out of sight, bears a close analogy to high poetry. No wonder then if great and eloquent men, confining their view to such instances, have formed too exclusive a notion of the art itself. It may still be true that much inferior subjects may prove sources of poetry to this or that individual, in such measure as they fill his whole mind, and set his imagination at work in default of realities.

So much for the present, and surely on no mean authority, for the meaning of the term Poetry, when it is applied by analogy to the other arts.

The principle on which it is also applied to differences in national character, to sects of philosophy, sometimes even to theological systems, is perhaps yet more obvious. The Spaniards, we said, taken as a nation, would probably be called more poetical than the French. Why, but because they are more constant and more imaginative; apter to dwell upon things distant, obsolete, unattainable, and to supply the absence of their favourite objects as they may, by associations however indirect and inadequate. Again, the moral view of Plato and Pythagoras, and in no small degree of Aristotle and Zeno, was poetical, as lifting men out of "the ignorant present," and causing them to shape even trivial actions by reference to an archetype beyond the reach of man. The legends of Woden and Thor were more poetical than that of Osiris or of Brahma, because the latter, whatever play of fancy or depth of meaning one may discern in them, have no common moral, no sentiment, to the expression of which they all converge, as the Scandinavian stories do to that of military heroism. Gothic architecture (to give an instance half in art and half in religion) is more poetical than Grecian, because more mysterious, and related to a higher and more enthusiastic sentiment; the one to the love of perfect Form, the other to true Christian devotion. Finally, of the old Catholic views (if one may without profaneness introduce such a subject to close a group of miscellaneous earthly examples)—of the views of the Fathers it may be said, that they were more poetical than any others in the Church, filling the soul, even to overflowing, with the highest and greatest Objects, and, by the doctrine of sacramental signs, assisting her to find and use, every where and always, means effectual, though indirect, for realizing to herself those Objects, and bringing them near.

As far as these instances go, it would seem that the analogical applications of the word poetry coincide well enough with Aristotle's notion of it, as consisting chiefly in Imitation or Expression, provided we understand that term with the two following qualifications:—1. That the thing to be imitated or expressed is some object of desire or regret, or some other imaginative feeling, the direct indulgence whereof is impeded:—2. That the mode of imitation or expression is *indirect*, the instruments of it being, for the most part, associations more or less accidental.

It would seem also that most of the leading phenomena of poetry may be solved by this account of its nature. To take first that which is most obvious, its connection with metre and music. Setting aside all mysterious natural aptitude, such as universal experience appears to attest, in certain combinations and orders of sounds, as compared with certain passions and moods of mind in ourselves; the very task of metrical arrangement will fall in with the poetical instinct, such as has been above described, in two respects. On the one hand, it shapes out a sort of channel for wild and tumultuous feelings to vent themselves by; feelings whose very excess and violence would seem to make the utterance of them almost impossible, for the very throng of thoughts and words, crowding all at once to demand expression. In such cases, the conventional rules of metre and rhythm may evidently have the effect of determining, in some one direction, the overflow of sentiment and expression, wherewith the mind might otherwise be fairly oppressed. On the other hand, the like rules may be no less useful, in throwing a kind of veil over those strong or deep emotions, which need relief, but cannot endure publicity. The very circumstance of their being expressed in verse draws off attention from the violence of the feelings themselves, and enables people to say things which they could not venture on in prose, much in the same way as the musical accompaniment gives meaning to the gestures of the dance, and hinders them from appearing to the bystanders merely fantastic. This effect of metre seems quite obvious as far as regards the sympathies of others. Emotions which in their unrestrained expression would appear too keen and outrageous to kindle fellow feeling in any one, are mitigated, and become comparatively tolerable, not to say interesting to us, when we find them so far under controul, as to leave those who feel them at liberty to pay attention to measure and rhyme, and the other expedients of metrical composition.

But over and above the effect on others, we apprehend that even in a writer's own mind there commonly exists a sort of instinctive delicacy, which finds its account in the work of arrang-

ing lines and syllables, and is content to utter, by their aid, what it would have shrunk from setting down in the language of conversation: the metrical form thus furnishing, at the same time, a vent for eager feeling, and a veil of reserve to draw over them. All this, if it may be said without irreverence, would seem to be exemplified in perfection in the Psalms, and in those other portions of the inspired writings which take the form of impassioned poetry. From their perfect parallelism, they are the most artificial of all compositions, yet none ever so apt to relieve the deepest and most overflowing minds; exhibiting, therefore, by their very form, as compared with their matter, the perfection of that self-controul which must itself be the perfection of a mixed creature such as man: "thoughts that breathe and words that burn," exactly obeying a certain high law, and shaped by it into perfect order.

This notion of the uses of metre, as subsidiary to the end we attribute to poetry, may seem to be confirmed by reference to those compositions, to which the term poetry is applied without any sort of metre. Something will always be discoverable in them, which answers the purpose just now assigned to numbers; of regulating, and thereby mitigating, the expression of feeling, and so reconciling to it both the writer and the reader. Thus, in the prose romances of Sir Walter Scott, and in all others which would be justly considered poetical, it will be found, we believe, that the story is in fact interposed, as a kind of transparent veil, between the listener and the narrator's real drift and feelings. The history of *Waverley*, or *Henry Morton*, or *Ivanhoe*, is but a pretext for the author's employing himself on those scenes, and characters, and sentiments, which would best satisfy the cravings of his own ruling fancy. The rules of painting, sculpture, architecture, music, answer perhaps the same purpose, whenever we find in any of their provinces respectively what would be commonly denominated poetical composition. Men's attending to proportions, perspective, harmony, throughout the indulgence of emotions ever so vehement, is like articulation in the sounds they utter; it distinguishes our grief or joy from the mere sensations of infants or of irrational animals.

Thus poetry, in its metrical form as well as in its substance, would seem to be deducible from two great instinctive necessities of our common nature—the same to which it was long ago referred by Aristotle: the need of some vent for absorbing or exciting thoughts, which he calls imitation or expression: and the need of so controuling that expression, as that the presence of reason, subduing and ordering it, shall be felt, and make itself

discernible throughout; which in this case becomes what he calls the instinct of harmony and of rhythm.

Another phenomenon connected with poetry, which would seem to accord well with the foregoing account of its origin, is the sort of character, which in common life is usually regarded as poetical—the combination of shyness with eagerness, of reserve with enthusiasm: the state of mind which makes people unable to remain quiet, yet causes them to shrink, almost with loathing, from any thing like an unreserved exposure of their feelings. In sketching the poetical temperament, the traits generally adopted, we imagine, would be such as in Beattie's Minstrel:

“ Responsive to the tuneful pipe, when all
In sprightly dance the village youth was join'd,
Edwin, of melody aye held in thrall,
From the rude gambol far remote reclin'd,
Sooth'd with the soft notes warbling down the wind :”—

or as the following, related by Burns of himself. “ There is scarcely any earthly object gives me more—I do not know if I should call it *pleasure*—but something which exalts me, something which enraptures me—than to walk in the sheltered side of the wood, or high plantation, in a cloudy winter-day, and hear the stormy wind howling among the trees, and raving over the plain. It is my best season for devotion.” It is obvious that all such anecdotes tend to exemplify more or less exactly, what has just now been said, of Expression, *controuled and modified by a certain reserve*, being the very soul of Poetry.

On the same principle may be explained the fact, that love of natural objects, and of whatever makes scenery, especially of the wilder and more romantic, rather than of the cultivated and beautiful kind, is an acknowledged element in the poetical character. Lovers of scenery may perhaps be found, who would nowhere be accounted poetical: but you would hardly find a poetical temperament, not keenly alive to the forms and sounds of nature, so far as circumstances place them within its reach. This seems to be best explained in the supposition, that there is a certain intended harmony, between those forms or sounds on the one hand, and our tempers, settled or varying, our shades and combinations of thought and feeling, on the other hand. So that minds full or excited, being placed where there is store of such objects, are instinctively drawn to select and combine those among them, which respond most truly to their own mood at the time. And this taste, whether going on silently and instinctively within the mind itself, as the person looks around him, or recorded by the pen or pencil, or in any other way, supplies just the kind of indirect vent or re-

lief, which we have proposed as the essential characteristic of poetry, and the constant object of aspiration to poetical minds.

Here, no doubt, is one *final* cause of poetry; to innumerable persons it acts as a safety valve, tending to preserve them from mental disease. At the same time a circumstance is explained, which is frequently felt as a disparagement of the poetical character; that it is in some sort allied to extravagance and distraction of mind. Plato,* as is well known, takes this for an inseparable adjunct, if not for the leading idea, of poetry, that it lies in a sort of unaccountable enthusiasm, inspired, but to men appearing like insanity. Aristotle assigns as the natural qualification of a poet, that he should be *εὐφυής ἢ μανικός*: i. e. that he should either be possessed with some overpowering thought or emotion, requiring such relief as we have described, in order to prevent it from terminating in actual madness; or else that he should have the power of transforming himself into the likeness of one so possessed and so relieving himself:—a distinction of which more will be said presently. And Shakespeare, in lines too well known to be here quoted, reckons “the lunatic, the lover, and the poet,” but as three specimens of the same general head. Testimonies these, which all appear more or less favourable to the doctrine, that poetry is the proper relief of minds, overpowered as it were with some engrossing idea.

The distinction from Aristotle, noticed a little above, will remove one of the most plausible objections to our theory. If we are asked, are there not multitudes of poets, confessedly of a high order of excellence, in whose works it will be impossible to assign any one such central thought or instinct, attracting to itself the writer's whole mind; we cannot deny it. We have, for example, Dryden. It were a strange definition of poetry which should exclude him; yet who shall say what was the prevailing object which forced him into poetical expression? seeing that he seems to have written equally *con amore* on opposite sides of the same question: his thoughts breathe and his words burn as keenly for Cromwell as for Charles. We should say then of Dryden, that he had in perfection the *εὐφυία*, the versatility and power of transforming himself into the resemblance of real sentiment, which the great philosopher has set down as one natural qualification for poetry, but that he wanted the other and more genuine spring of the art—*τὸ μανικόν*—the enthusiasm, the passionate devotion to some one class of objects or train of thought. He could see and imitate such enthusiasm in others, and help them to express it, and often kindle it in his readers; but not feeling it in himself, he could not

* Ion. c. 5, p. 534; Phædr. p. 243.

write as if he felt it. If we may be allowed to denote the distinction here intended by the words *primary* and *secondary*, we would say, place Dryden, if you will, at the very head of the list of *secondary* poets; but there is a want of reality about his manner which must hinder his admission into the other class. Had his circumstances in life been other than they were, he might still have written verse to amuse himself, or exercise his talent, but we find in him no indication of an overflowing mind, needing relief, which would have compelled him to write in any case. Had there been no poets before, he would not have invented poetry; whereas no one, we think, can read with understanding Homer or Lucretius, Virgil or Shakespeare, without just the contrary impression.

It will be perceived that the words, *Primary* and *Secondary*, are not here used as measuring the ability of the writer, but the kind and character of the composition. It will often, perhaps oftener than not, happen, that there is greater skill in composition, and felicity of language, in those who adopt poetry as a mere mode or branch of literature, than in those who are urged into it for their own relief. Just as well instructed foreigners may speak a language with more exactness and propriety than the ruder natives, yet will there be always a certain indigenous tone, distinguishing, to a practised ear, those who cannot help speaking it, from those who have more or less perfectly brought themselves to do so. Should it, then, at any time happen that one speaks of famous writers, Euripides, for instance, or Milton, or Dryden, as belonging but to the secondary class in poetry, this is no depreciation at all of their abilities: it is merely saying, that they rather *made themselves* great in that line, than *were driven* to it by an *instinct* of nature. Whether, in consequence, one charm, and that the most appropriate charm of poetry, be wanting in those writers, or no, is a different question, only to be solved by the experience of unbiassed readers.

Another seeming difficulty is, how to account on the foregoing hypothesis for such a phenomenon as a "full-grown epic:" the construction of which might naturally seem too complicated and too calm an employment for minds overflowing in the manner above described. But this is an objection only at first sight. The mind has its ἡθῆ as well as its πάθη,—its permanent tastes, habits, inclinations, which, when directly checked, are as capable of relief by poetical expression as the more sudden and violent emotions. Only the *mode* of relief will vary: as lyric poems differ from narrative or descriptive. Suppose, e. g. that Homer wrote under the pressure of a romantic sort of regret for the heroic age of Greece, which he knew only by the faint traces of it among which he had been brought up; that Virgil sought an

outlet for his love of woods and rivers and all that is refined and melancholy in nature; Lucretius, on the contrary, for the deep awe with which he contemplated the mysterious scenery of the universe; that Æschylus, by his tragedies, lightened his oppressive sense of the misery of man, and the dark ways of Providence; and that Shakespeare gave play to the real sympathy which he seems to have felt towards all natural and common affections in a degree hardly conceivable by ordinary men. In these several cases it would appear, that the elaborate narration, argument, or description may as truly relieve the state of mind to which we ascribe it, as any sudden burst of high or plaintive feeling would be relieved by lyrical or elegiac composition.

In a survey of this kind, however, one thing must be taken into account, not so obvious at first sight; viz. that instinctive or primary poetry does not always succeed in finding out, among existing moulds or forms, the most appropriate whereby to express itself. The mind is often turned, by accident, or caprice, or some external influence, into a channel more or less inconvenient for its movements. Virgil's cast of thought, it is evident, was altogether rural and melancholy, flowing out naturally in such a poem as the *Georgics*. When the command of Augustus, or some other motive, determined him to write an *Æneid*,* it is curious to see this instinct working its way through all the incumbrance of the epic story; availing itself of every gleam and breath for the admission of country sights and sounds, and the comments of a shy and pensive yet playful mind. As far as the epic goes, he is a secondary poet, working evidently by rule, and against the grain; but the development which is continually going on of his true self, in descriptive or moralizing sketches, gives to the *Æneid* also the freshness and charm, which Virgil never surely could have imparted to it, in its professed character of a warlike Homeric tale. The epic, therefore, or any other form, may act, as was said, like a safety-valve to a full mind, either directly, as in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, or indirectly and incidentally, as in the *Æneid*.

By keeping in mind the distinctions above explained, first between *primary* and *secondary* poets, next between the poetical expression of *settled tastes* and of *present feelings*, we may, it is apprehended, go a good way in classifying the treasures of the art. But it is evident that no complete arrangement can be made of them; since if our notion of poetry in general be correct, the subjects of it must needs be as various as the tastes and passions which require relief in mankind, and the modes as numerous as the associations of different individuals. In fact, every person

* See Froide's Remains, vol. ii. p. 318.

whatever who has either decided tastes or strong emotions will have a poetry of his own; i. e. he will hit upon his own ways of indirectly expressing or relieving such his inclinations, when their direct indulgence is checked. And this expression being put into metrical words, constitutes, as we have endeavoured to show, what the world has agreed to call poetry, and as such to sympathize with it.

Hence the peculiar delight which some men feel in some poetry will be found, if analyzed, mainly to depend on the sympathy they feel for the character of the author, indirectly made known to them through his verses. It is *that*, much more than the subject, or the skill of treating it, which really takes possession of the reader's mind, and makes him uneasy if he has not the volume in hand.

At the same time, we are far from asserting that such a fondness, existing in any person, or in any number of persons, for a particular poem, is a certain indication of the author's being of that class, which we have ventured to denominate *Primary*. It may be, their liking for him arises not from any particular truth of expression in him, but from some accidental association of their own. In feeling a pulse, it may sometimes happen that the pulsation which seems to us another's is in our own veins. So in the case we are now imagining, the poetry is in the reader not in the writer, but the writer gets the credit of it.

Many other observations might be made on the tests of primary, as distinguished from secondary poetry, which is indeed one of the most curious and interesting portions of the whole theory; bearing (among other things) no small analogy to the difference between what is genuine, what more or less affected, in manners and conduct. But we will not dwell longer on mere preliminaries. If we have at all succeeded in explaining to the reader what our notion of real poetry is, he cannot but perceive how much to our purpose, either in the way of confirmation or correction, must be the appearance of such a Life as this; affording us abundantly the means of ascertaining, whether the character of this one great Poet at least were really such as we should have gathered from a general view of his writings—his tastes and inclinations, those which we may conceive instinctively shaping to themselves such a vent or channel, as those writings exhibit. The biography may serve as an actual experiment, to verify or disprove the conclusions, which the theory as applied to the poems would give. We will explain our meaning. If poetry be, as above supposed, the expression of decided taste or strong emotion, checked in its direct indulgence; and if the poetry of Sir Walter Scott was of the primary or instinctive class; we should expect to find with tolerable certainty,

in so large a mass of materials, the one prevailing character or element, the centre of attraction, round which the whole had gathered; and again, on his life becoming known to us in minute detail, such as these volumes disclose it in, we should not only look for perpetual indications of the same ruling taste or passion, but also for such occasional admixture of checks and interruptions, and reasons for reserve, as would be most apt, on our hypothesis, to urge him into some kind of poetry. These are the requirements of our theory; now what are the facts? On the one side, the poetry of Sir W. Scott,—including as above, under that term, the whole series of the *Waverley Novels*, although not written in verse,—is possessed and animated throughout by the spirit, not simply of chivalrous honour, but of that particular form of chivalry which had reigned among his own ancestors, the clans of the Scottish border. It is the nucleus round which his successive creations accumulated. We may in a manner account for them all, on the supposition, that the author had indulged himself, early and long, in a kind of imaginative regret for the departure of those heroic days from his own native soil and home. It might however have been imagined that all this, instead of expressing real feeling, was merely the excursiveness of a full and strong mind, over the ground which chanced to be most familiar to it. But this idea vanishes at once, when we come on the other side to be acquainted with the author's life. We there find, that what a superficial view might have represented as the mere play of his literary fancy, was in fact so serious a principle in him, that one, who was well entitled to judge, considers it as furnishing the clue no less to the turning points of his character and course of life, than to the cast and tenor of his writings.

“The whole system of conceptions and aspirations, of which his early active life was the exponent, resolves itself into a romantic idealization of Scottish aristocracy. He desired to secure for his descendants (for himself he had very soon acquired something infinitely more flattering to self-love and vanity) a decent and honourable middle station, in a scheme of life so constituted originally, and which his fancy pictured as capable of being so revived, as to admit of the kindest personal contact between (almost) the peasant at the plough, and the magnate with revenues rivalling the monarch's. It was the patriarchal,—the clan system, that he thought of; one that never prevailed even in Scotland (within the historical period that is to say) except in the Highlands, and in his own dear Border land. This system knew nothing of commerce; as little certainly of literature, beyond the raid-ballad of the wandering harper,

‘High plac'd in hall, a welcome guest.’

His filial imagination shrunk from marring the antique, if barbarous, simplicity. I suspect that at the highest elevation of his literary renown, when princes bowed to his name, and nations thrilled at it, he would have

considered losing all that at a change of the wind as nothing, compared to parting with his place as the Cadet of Harden and Clansman of Buccleugh, who had, no matter by what means, reached such a position, that when a notion arose of embodying a 'Buccleugh Legion,' not a Scott in the Forest would have thought it otherwise than natural for Abbotsford to be one of the field officers."—vol. vii. 405. "

This testimony, coinciding so nearly with what our theory leads us to expect, would seem to confirm that theory as strongly as a single instance can do. But it may be well to explain a little more particularly, first, what is meant by the assertion that Scott's central idea was the chivalry of the Borders especially, and next, how critically many circumstances in his life were adapted to furnish at once the check and the spur, the combination whereof seems to constitute the proper and immediate cause of poetical expression.

Now there are two remarks commonly in people's mouths when they are comparing Scott's writings one with another, and both of them acknowledged just by Mr. Lockhart, which lead immediately to the notion we are now enforcing: the one, that his *first* works in each kind, the Lay of the last Minstrel and Waverley, have a charm about them more vivid than any of the rest; the other, that free and energetic as Scott always appears, it is upon *Scottish* ground exclusively that his genius seems to be properly at home. *Border Romance*, and *Highland Romance*, are felt to be the two subjects most congenial to him: the subjects wherewith all that is most characteristic and engaging in his later writings is found associated. Perhaps on further consideration it will be perceived that these two subjects do in fact coincide; that as other scenes and histories, treated by him, captivate more or less as they have more or less analogy with these, so the second of these, the Highland subject, engaged him, and of course his readers, most effectually by its close resemblance in many parts, almost amounting to identity, with the first. For illustration's sake, we will suppose his narratives, in prose and in verse, arranged in three classes: the Lay of the Last Minstrel standing at their head as a kind of archetype or standard form, to which the rest, how diversified soever, may in effect be referred. There will be Border stories, such as the Lay itself, Guy Mannering, Old Mortality, the Monastery, &c.: Highland stories: e.g. the Lady of the Lake, Waverley, Rob Roy: and stories more or less remote from either, whether within the limits of Scotland, as Marmion, the Antiquary, the Heart of Mid Lothian, the Pirate; or altogether foreign, as Ivanhoe, Quintin Durward, Kenilworth, the Tales of the Crusaders.

Now what was there in the supposed archetype, the Border

Chivalry such as it is represented in the *Lay*, to distinguish it, in Scott's eyes especially, from other forms of baronial and feudal life? There was the spirit of clanship—the tie of blood added to that of feudal allegiance: there was the union of local and family quarrels with national warfare after the manner of borderers; and the combination of high heroic feeling with the recklessness of marauding adventure: there was perpetual connection, more than enough to dignify the subject, with the greatest names and events in Scottish history; and above all, there was the continually recurring sense, “These are my own native scenes, these are the men whose blood is running in my veins.” He had known the ground from his childish years, and felt as if he had known the men too: he felt that he had a right and interest in them such as few besides him could have; and so he went warbling on, with constant attachment and unexhausted powers, only with infinite variations high and low, the strains which had been the delight of his very boyhood. The well-known origin of the *Lay* very happily illustrates this. It was not undertaken with a view to publicity, or with any thought of poetical excellence, but simply as one among other sallies by which he was accustomed to transfer himself in fancy into the old Border times. Of success as an original author he seems previously to have had little or no thought; and it is most remarkable that he should have gone on so long in literary pursuits, before either he or the world made the discovery of his having any particular talent of the kind.

“The story of Gilpin Horner was told by an old gentleman to Lady Dalkeith, and she, much diverted with his actually believing so grotesque a tale, insisted that I should make it into a Border ballad. I don't know if ever you saw my lovely chieftainess; if you have, you must be aware that it is *impossible* for any one to refuse her request, as she has more of the angel in face and temper than any one alive: so that if she had asked me to write a ballad on a broomstick I must have attempted it. I began a few verses, to be called the Goblin Page: and they lay long by me, till the applause of some friends whose judgment I asked induced me to resume the poem; so on I wrote, knowing no more than the man in the moon how I was to end. At length the story appeared so uncouth, that I was fain to put it into the mouth of my old minstrel; lest the nature of it should be misunderstood, and I should be suspected of setting up a new school of poetry, instead of a feeble attempt to imitate the old.” “It has great faults,” he had said just before, “of which no one can be more sensible than I am myself. Above all, it is deficient in that continuity which a story ought to have, and which, were it to write again, I would endeavour to give it. But I began and wandered forward, like one in a pleasant country, getting to the top of one hill to see a prospect, and to the bottom of another to enjoy a shade;

and what wonder if my course has been devious and desultory ?"—vol. ii. pp. 27, 28.

Mr. Lockhart's remarks are well worth adding.

"It is curious to trace the small beginnings and gradual development of his design. The lovely Countess of Dalkeith hears a wild rude legend of Border *diablerie*, and sportively asks him to make it the subject of a ballad. He had been already labouring in the elucidation of the 'quaint Inglis' ascribed to an ancient seer and bard of the same district, and perhaps completed his own sequel, intending the whole to be included in the third volume of the *Minstrelsy*. He assents to Lady Dalkeith's request, and casts about for some new variety of diction and rhyme, which might be adopted without impropriety in a closing strain of the same collection. Sir John Stoddart's casual recitation, a year before, of Coleridge's unpublished *Christabel*, had fixed the music of that able fragment in his memory; and it occurs to him, that by throwing the story of Gilpin Horner into somewhat of a similar cadence, he might produce such an echo of the later metrical romance, as would serve to connect his *conclusion* of the primitive Sir Tristrem with his imitations of the common popular ballad in the Grey Brother and Eve of St. John. A single scene of feudal festivity in the hall of Branksome, disturbed by some pranks of a non-descript goblin, was probably all that he contemplated; but his accidental confinement (through a kick from a horse) in the midst of the volunteer camp gave him leisure to meditate his theme to the sound of the bugle:—and suddenly there flashes on him the idea of extending his simple outline, so as to embrace a vivid panorama of that old Border life of war and tumult and all earnest passions, with which his researches on the 'Minstrelsy' had by degrees fed his imagination, until even the minutest feature had been taken home and realized with unconscious intenseness of sympathy; so that he had won for himself, *in the past*, another world, hardly less complete or familiar than the present. Erskine or Cranstoun suggests that he would do well to divide the poem into cantos, and prefix to each a motto explanatory of the action, after the fashion of Spenser in the *Fairy Queen*. He pauses for a moment; and the happiest conception of the frame-work of a picturesque narrative that ever occurred to any poet—one that Homer might have envied—the creation of the ancient harper starts to life. By such steps did the *Lay of the Last Minstrel* grow out of the *Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border*."—*Life*, vol. ii. p. 23.

There is somewhat pleasing, may we not say affecting, in the thought, that one whom he valued and respected so much as he did the late Duchess of Buccleugh should have been the person whose casual request led to the composition of his first great poem, and so hit out the spark which has now become such an orb of poetical fame: that she who in classical language would have been called his *muse* was one of whom he could speak as follows: writing to Mr. Morritt on his return from a tour in the Hebrides.

“ I would have you to know I only returned on the 10th current, and the most agreeable thing that I found was your letter. I am sure you must know I had need of something pleasant, for the death of the beautiful, the kind, the affectionate and generous Duchess of Buccleugh gave me a shock, which would not have been exceeded, unless by my own family's sustaining a similar deprivation. She was indeed a light set upon a hill, and had all the grace which the most accomplished manners and the most affable address could give to those virtues, by which she was raised still higher than by rank. As she always distinguished me by her regard and confidence, and as I had many opportunities of seeing her in the active discharge of duties, in which she rather resembled a descended angel than an earthly being, you will excuse my saying so much about my own feelings on an occasion where sorrow has been universal.

“ The survivor,” (we cannot refrain from adding the rest of the passage, although not immediately connected with this part of our argument, both on account of its own beauty as an expression of considerate friendship and manly grief, and the light which it throws on an important subject, to be hereafter more particularly mentioned :) “ the survivor has displayed a strength and firmness of mind seldom equalled, where the affection has been so strong and mutual, and amidst the very high station and commanding fortune, which so often render self-control more difficult, because so far from being habitual. I trust for his own sake, as well as for that of thousands to whom his life is directly essential, and hundreds of thousands to whom his example is important, that God, as He has given him fortitude to bear this inexpressible shock, will add strength of constitution to support him in the struggle. He has written to me on the occasion in a style becoming a man and a Christian submissive to the will of God, and willing to avail himself of the consolations which remain among his family and friends. I am going to see him, and how we shall meet, God knows : but though ‘ an iron man of iron mould ’ upon many of the occasions of life in which I see people most affected, and a peculiar contemner of the common-place sorrow which I see paid to the departed, this is a case in which my stoicism will not serve me. They both gave me reason to think they loved me, and I returned their regard with the most sincere attachment ; the distinction of rank being, I think, set apart on both sides. But God's will be done. I will dwell no longer upon this subject.”—vol. iii. p. 290—2.

To return to our argument, and resume the classification we were attempting to institute of his works : the *Lay*, as it was undertaken, so to speak, from instinct, so it seems to have combined beyond all other subjects the points towards which his instinct bore him ; and not least, perhaps in the time in which the narrative is cast. For it is observable that Scott loved throughout to dwell rather on the decaying age of chivalry than on its high and palmy state. The 16th and 17th centuries suit him better on the whole than the period of the Crusades, or of the wars of York and Lancaster : chiefly, as we believe,] because the former era

seemed to lie more within reach, and more easily blended itself with the recollections of his boyhood. According to the strong common sense and love of truth which were prevailing ingredients in his character as a man, mere fancy never satisfied him as a poet. He always wanted to realize things; to feel that he had under him a true substantial spot of earth; and living, as he did, in a kind of imaginative regret for the decay of chivalry and clanship, the age of Elizabeth, when such splendours were in great measure matter of history, had something in it more engaging to him than the earlier generations of knights and enchanters of whom he read in his favourite romances. Thus even in the date assigned to it, the story of the Lay was most attractive.

And though both this, and the intimate association of the narrative with the fortunes of the house of Buccleugh were wanting in the subsequent Border romances, they possess to the full the other great charm of the Lay,—the perpetual feeling that the author is hovering over things and places dear to him almost from his childhood. The attachment to such early recollections, and the shadowy magic by which nature delights to recall them, is the leading feature in the Bertram of Guy Mannering. Nothing of the kind surely was ever so exquisite as his landing by his father's ruined castle, and wondering at his own dreary consciousness of having been once familiar with the scene, followed by the incident of the ballad tune taken up by the girl who was washing just by. We will transcribe part of the passage, though doubtless well known to all our readers.

“ ‘Why is it,’ he thought, continuing to follow out the succession of ideas which the scene prompted—‘why is it that some scenes awaken thoughts which belong as it were to dreams of early and shadowy recollection, such as my old Brahmin Moonshie would have ascribed to a state of previous existence? Is it the visions of our sleep that float confusedly in our memory, and are recalled by the appearance of such real objects as in any respects correspond to the phantoms they presented to our imagination? How often do we find ourselves in society which we have never before met, and yet feel impressed with a mysterious and ill-defined consciousness that neither the scene, the speakers, nor the subject is entirely new; nay, feel as if we could anticipate that part of the conversation which has not yet taken place! It is even so with me while I gaze upon that ruin; nor can I divest myself of the idea, that these massive towers, and that dark gateway, retiring through its deep-vaulted and ribbed arches, and dimly lighted by the court-yard beyond, is not entirely strange to me; can it be that they have been familiar to me in infancy, and that I am to seek in their vicinity those friends of whom my childhood had still a tender though faint remembrance?’ Presently afterwards, ‘It is odd enough,’ said Bertram, fixing his eye upon the arms and gateway, and partly as it were thinking aloud, ‘it is odd the tricks

which our memory plays us; the remnants of an old prophecy, or song, or rhyme, of some kind or other, recur to my recollection upon hearing that motto.' And again: arguing upon the embarrassing state of his own feelings and recollection,—'Yes,' he said, 'I preserved my language among the sailors, most of whom spoke English; and when I could get into a corner by myself I used to sing all that song over from beginning to end. I have forgot it all now; but I remember the tune well, though I cannot guess what should at present so strongly recall it to my memory.'

"He took his flageolet from his pocket and played a simple melody. Apparently the tune awoke the corresponding associations of a damsel, who, at a fine spring about half way down the descent, and which had once supplied the castle with water, was engaged in bleaching linen. She immediately took up the song.—

'Are these the links of Forth, she said,
Or are they the crooks of Dee,
Or the bonnie woods of Warroch-head,
That I sae fain would see?'

"'By heaven,' said Bertram, 'it is the very ballad. I must learn these words from the girl.'"

All this seems to us to acquire the greatest additional interest, when we come to know the particulars of Sir Walter's life, and that *Guy Mannering* is the tale in which, perhaps more distinctly than in any other, he has embodied his own personal remembrances, both in the transactions with the advocate, Pleydell, and in the scenery of Liddesdale; while the hints which occasionally recur, that all takes place within the sphere of "the Deuk, God bless him," Dinmont's landlord, help us to see how the author was ever looking wistfully towards his own clan and home—what a family pride and pleasure he felt in tracing among the modern Border farmers the hospitality and frankness and independence of the old Border warriors, with something occasionally of their pugnacity.

It was almost a matter of course that such a mind, so trained, having found accidentally its power over other men's sympathies, and beginning to look abroad for subjects beyond the Border, should at once light upon the Highlands; a region which had the great advantage of exhibiting its peculiar form of the chivalric and feudal life in fragments far more perfect than any thing to be found in the Lowlands; a region, too, with which Scott had very early become acquainted, and where no doubt he had been accustomed instinctively to verify or correct the impressions which his reading had given him of the bearing of human nature under such a system. The Highland and the Border life were alike characterised by clanship and the other great marks of a feudal state—by a regular course of foray and reprisal, checked mainly by a common hatred of a neighbouring race, and mingling con-

tinually with the great stream of Scottish history. The differences in scenery, sentiment, and modes of warfare, were just such as he knew how to make available for bringing out both pictures with full effect. Yet it must be allowed on the whole that the Lowland feeling not undecidedly prevails. One always perceives that the narrator himself would rather fight on horse-back than on foot. None of his Highland martial ballads are so completely *con amore* as that (e. g.) in the Antiquary:—

“ They saddled a hundred milk-white steeds,
They hae bridled a hundred black,
With a chafron of steel on each horse’s head,
And a good knight upon his back.

“ They had na ridden a mile, a mile,
A mile, but barely ten,
When Donald came branking down the brae,
Wi’ twenty thousand men.

“ Their tartans they were waving wide,
Their glaives were glancing clear :
The pibrochs rung frae side to side,
Would deafen ye to hear.

“ The great Earl in his stirrups stood,
That Highland host to see :—
‘ Now here a knight that’s stout and good
May prove a jeopardie.

“ ‘ What wouldst thou do, my squire so gay,
That rides beside my rein,
Were ye Glenallan’s Earl this day,
And I were Roland Cheyne ?

“ ‘ To turn the rein were shame and sin,
To fight were wondrous peril :—
What would ye do now, Roland Cheyne,
Were ye Glenallan’s Earl ?’

“ ‘ Were I Glenallan’s Earl this tide,
And ye were Roland Cheyne,
My spur should be in my horse’s side,
And my bridle on his mane.

“ ‘ If they hae twenty thousand blades,
And we twice ten times ten,
Yet they hae but their tartan plaids,
And we are mail-clad men.

“ ‘ My horse shall ride through ranks so rude,
As through the moorland fern ;
Then ne’er let the gentle Norman blood
Grow cauld for Highland kerne.’ ”

His “ Bonnie Dundee ” will occur to every one as being pitched in the same key :—

" The Gordon has ask'd of him whither he goes—
 ' Wheresoever shall guide me the spirit of Montrose :
 Your grace in short space shall bear tidings of me,
 Or that low lies the bonnet of bonnie Dundee.'

* * * * *

He wav'd his proud hand, and the trumpets were blown,
 The kettle-drums beat, and the horsemen mov'd on,
 Till on Ravelston crag and on Clermiston lee
 Died away the wild war-note of bonnie Dundee."

Again, noble as are the views of Highland scenery, his touch in describing them appears to us that of a visiter rather than of a native. In the progress, for example, from Glasgow to Rob Roy's country, and in the wanderings of Fitz-James in the *Lady of the Lake*, every thing is regularly described. He does not assume, in the exquisite manner which lends such a charm to the *Lay*, that the reader knows all the ground, and only wants one bold line or two to call up the complete picture. Still, the Highland subject, with a few exceptions which will presently be accounted for, would seem to stand second in order of interest; owing, as we conjecture, to its most nearly resembling his first and darling field of thought.

Among the other tales, a distinction has been made (as already remarked), and on the whole perhaps a just distinction, in favour of those whose scene is laid in Scotland. And of these, three more especially seem to bear the stamp of their author's genius: the *Antiquary*, the *Heart of Mid-Lothian*, and the *Pirate*. But the tragic part of the *Antiquary*, the fortunes of the House of Glenallan, turns altogether upon points of feudal feeling; and the lighter part, the character of the *Antiquary* himself, is now known to be grounded almost entirely on Scott's reminiscence of his early life; and on his real sympathy for a kind of lore, which, if not nearly akin to the romantic, has ever proved to it at least a most useful handmaid. Viewed in this light, the antiquarian parts of his correspondence acquire an interest for the general reader which could not well otherwise belong to them. For "Walter had soon begun to collect out-of-the-way things of all sorts. He had," in his *den* at his father's house, before his professional life had begun, "more books than shelves; a small painted cabinet, with Scotch and Roman coins in it, &c. A claymore and Lochaber axe, given him by old Invernahyle, mounted guard on a little print of Prince Charlie; and Broughton's saucer was hooked up against the wall below it."—vol. i. p. 178. At the time, no doubt, this seemed to his acquaintance a mere fancy; but we perceive now that it was a poetical instinct; he was seeking to realize by visible tokens and memorials, the scenes

and events which he delighted to imagine. "He was *making himsell* a' the time," said one of his old companions: "but he didna ken may be what he was about till years had passed. At first he thought o' little, I dare say, but the queerness and the fun."—vol. i. p. 195. The two ingredients then which have been before mentioned, the love of Scottish chivalry, and the delight he had in living over again his early days, will account for whatever is most striking in this romance also, undoubtedly one of the most generally captivating of the series.

As to the story of *Jeanie Deans*, remote as it is from any thing that can be called chivalrous, that defect is more than made up by excess in the other sort of interest. He has told it like something that had happened at his own door, availing himself of his thorough knowledge, both of all the localities of Edinburgh, and of the manners and opinions of the stricter class of Presbyterians, among whom, from his parents' bias, he had received much of his early training.

The *Pirate* remains; the likeliest an exception to our theory of all Sir Walter's compositions; for it is neither a knightly tale, nor do his own Border recollections predominate in it; yet most readers, we suppose, will agree in ranking it with those which have been mentioned, as truly and freely flowing from his peculiar vein. The *Life* explains this, by producing his journal of a voyage, in which he made himself thoroughly acquainted with the scenery and manners of Zetland. In the cast of legendary superstition current among that people he was long before versed; and his intimacy with the family of Clark, of Eldin, had taught him early not a little, for a landsman, of nautical society, and of life on shipboard. Then the characters of Minna and Breda, if report speak true, are sketched from the life; and the whale-fishing, the cliffs and craigsmen, even the wrecking of the Zetlanders, were just the wild sports and forays of the Border, only on another element. On the whole, the *Pirate* may seem less remote from the former fields of his genius than it appears at first sight; and it possesses in an eminent degree the charm of sea scenery, winds, waters, clouds, and cliffs; and also that which Sir Walter himself regarded as being eminently his own talisman. Having noticed in his journal that he had given an engraving of himself to young Davidoff "for his uncle, the celebrated Black Captain of the campaign of 1812; it is," he adds, "curious, that he should be interested in getting the resemblance of a person whose mode of attaining some distinction has been very different. But I am sensible, that if there be any good about my poetry or prose either, it is a hurried frankness of composition which pleases

soldiers, sailors, and young people of bold and active disposition. I have been no sigher in shades—no writer of

‘ Songs and sonnets, and rustical roundelays,
 kram’d on fancies, and whistled on reeds.’ ”—vol. vi. p. 321.

With regard to those narratives, the scene of which is laid either on the Continent or in England, on some of them Scott has set his peculiar mark, by making the heroes his own countrymen; as in *Nigel*, the *Talisman*, and *Quintin Durward*; in all which instances it will perhaps be found that there is a continual awakening of home associations and feelings. And what if we were to add *Woodstock* to this list? since the secret spell of that romance undoubtedly is the perpetual though silent reference to the martyred king, as if mysteriously present. In him, and after him in his family, Scott took peculiar interest, (as is illustrated by many new traits in these volumes,) not simply on principles of chivalrous honour and fidelity, but also because they were altogether Scottishmen, and their cause was bound up with that jealous feeling concerning their country’s independence, which he as a Borderer cherished throughout. Witness the delight he took in the success of his pamphlet on the banking system, under the name of *Malachi Malagrowther*. He really speaks of it in his journal with more satisfaction than is called forth by any of the great triumphs of his genius:—

“ *Malachi prospers and excites much attention. The Banks have bespoke 500 copies. The country is taking the alarm; and I think the Ministers will not dare to press the measure. I should rejoice to see the old red lion ramp a little, and the thistle again claim its NEMO ME IMPUNE.* I do believe Scotsmen will show themselves unanimous, at least where their cash is concerned. They shall not want backing. I incline to cry with Biron in *Love’s Labour’s Lost*, ‘ More atés, more atés’—stir them on. I suppose all imaginative people feel more or less of excitation from a scene of insurrection or tumult, or of general expression of national feeling. When I was a lad, poor Davie Douglas used to accuse me of being *cupidus novarum rerum*, and to say that I loved the stimulus of a broil. It might be so then and even still. ‘ Even in our ashes live their wonted fires.’ ”—vol. vi. p. 246.

The only great works of Scott, the chivalry of which has nothing in it to connect them particularly with Scotland, nothing at all of a Border or clannish character, are, we apprehend, *Ivanhoe* and *Kenilworth*; to which, perhaps, we should add *Anne of Geirestein*; though there is almost sufficient analogy between the Swiss and the Scots, through a long period of their history, to take the last-mentioned into the former class: and, magnificent as the other two are, we hope to be pardoned for asking, do they not

carry a more elaborate air than is usual with this author—the air of one writing from books, instead of expatiating *sub dio* among places and persons with which he was himself intimate? As we read them, we say to ourselves, This is not only high poetry, but also very learned history, chivalry painted in two of its most interesting aspects; for *Ivanhoe* displays it when it was most real, and filled the whole of public life; *Kenilworth*, when it lingered only in the shape of court pageantry, and a code of punctilious honour. But does the thought occur, that the painter is a real enthusiast, living in and for the remembrance of the times which he describes? We imagine not; and our solution of the fact would be, that in these instances the writer has wandered too far out of sight of Scotland and Scottish associations. He had a taste but not a passion for the subjects on which he was writing; whereas his local Border attachments were ingrained into the very substance of his character.

There are many affecting instances in his Italian tour of the manner in which he clung to those early feelings, even in the wreck of his health and decay of his mind. We find him, for example, surveying the antiquities of Malta with no small measure of curiosity and interest, treasuring up hints for future romances; and as he passed ruined forts and monasteries, or other feudal remains, in Southern Italy, we hear of his imagining stories to accord with the scene; but his bursts of real emotion and enthusiasm occur only with awakened reminiscences of Scotland.

“Near Nocera,” says Sir W. Gell, “I pointed out a tower situated on a high mountain, and guarding a pass by which a very steep and zigzag road leads towards Amalfi. I observed that it was possible, if the Saracens ever were really situated at Nocera dei Pagani, this tower might have been at the confines of the Amalfitan republic, and have been their frontier against the Mahometans. It was surprising how quickly he caught at any romantic circumstance, and I found, in a very short time, he had converted the Torre di Ciunse, or Chiunse, into a feudal residence, and already peopled it with a Christian host. He called it the Knights’ Castle, as long as it remained in sight, and soon after transferred its interest in the curious little towers used for pigeon shooting, which abound in the neighbourhood, though they were on the other side of the road.

“We visited on the following day the splendid Benedictine monastery of La Trinità della Cava, situated about three miles from the great road, and approached through a beautiful forest of chestnuts, spreading over most picturesque mountains. The day was fine, and Sir Walter really enjoyed the drive; and the scenery recalled to his mind something of the kind which he had seen in Scotland; on which he repeated the whole of the ballad of Jock of Hazledean with great emphasis, and in a clear voice. On the whole, Sir Walter was more pleased with the

monastery of La Cava, than with any place to which I had the honour to accompany him in Italy: the site, the woods, the organ, the size of the convent, and above all, the Lombard kings [pictures of whom were in the library], produced a poetical feeling; and the fine weather so raised his spirits, that in the forest he again recited *Jock of Hazledean* by my desire, after a long repetition from his favourite poem of *Hardyknute*."—vol. vii. p. 354.

Again,

"There is a point in going toward the Arco Felice, whence, at a turn of the road, a very extensive and comprehensive view is obtained of the lake of Avernus. The temple of Apollo, the Lucrine lake, the Monte Nuovo, Baïæ, Misenum, and the sea, are all seen at once; and here I considered it my duty, in quality of Cicerone, to enforce the knowledge of the localities. He attended to the names I repeated; and when I asked whether he thought himself sure of remembering the spot, he replied, that he had it perfectly in his mind. I found, however, that something in the place had inspired him with other recollections of his own beloved country and the Stuarts; for, on proceeding, he immediately repeated, in a grave tone, and with great emphasis,

Up the craggy mountain, and down the mossy glen,
We canna gang a milking, for Charlie and his men.

I could not help smiling at this strange commentary on my dissertation upon the lake of Avernus."—vol. vii. p. 356.

No sight in Rome seems to have captivated him so much as the villa which belonged to Cardinal York, and which still retains some pictures and other relics of the Stuarts.

But the most remarkable instance of his deep local affection is contained in the account of his return, almost in a state of insensibility, to the scenery of Tweedside.

"Sir Walter, prostrate in his carriage, was slung on shore, and conveyed from thence to Douglas's hotel, in St. Andrew's Square [Edinburgh], in the same complete apparent unconsciousness. . . . At a very early hour on the morning of Wednesday the 4th [July, 1832], we again placed him in his carriage, and he lay in the same torpid state during the first two stages on the road to Tweedside. But as we descended the vale of the Gala he began to gaze about him, and by degrees it was observed that he was recognizing the features of that familiar landscape. Presently he murmured a name or two: 'Gala water, surely;—Buckholm—Torwoodlee.' As we rounded the hill at Ladhope, and the outline of the Eildons burst upon him, he became greatly excited, and when turning himself on the couch his eye caught at length his own towers, at the distance of a mile, he sprang up with a cry of delight. The river being in flood, we had to go round a few miles by Melrose Bridge, and during the time this occupied, his woods and house being within prospect, it required occasionally both Dr. Watson's strength and mine, in addition to Nicholson's, to keep him in the carriage. After passing the bridge, the road for a few miles loses sight of Abbotsford, and he relapsed into his

stupor; but on gaining the bank immediately above it, his excitement became again ungovernable. Mr. Laidlaw was waiting at the porch, and assisted us in lifting him into the dining-room, where his bed had been prepared. He sat bewildered for a few moments, and then resting his eye on Laidlaw, said ‘Ha! Willie Laidlaw! O man, how often have I thought of you!’ By this time his dogs had assembled about his chair, they began to fawn upon him and lick his hands, and he alternately sobbed and smiled over them, till sleep oppressed him.”—vol. vii. pp. 385, 386.

Would it not be true to say, that this passage is but the expression, in sad truth and real life, of the same deep local attachment, which gives tone to the following tender stanzas, occurring among the earliest which Scott ever published? They describe, as will be remembered, the departure of Thomas the Rhymer, when finally summoned from his home by a fairy token.

“ The elfin harp, his neck around,
In minstrel guise he hung,
And on the wind, in doleful sound,
It’s dying accents rung.
Then forth he went—yet turn’d him oft
To view his ancient hall;
On the grey tower, in lustre soft,
The autumn moonbeams fall.
And Leader’s waves, like silver sheen,
Danc’d shimmering in the ray;
In deepening mass, at distance seen,
Broad Soltra’s mountains lay.
‘ Farewell, my father’s ancient tower,
‘ A long farewell,’ said he:
‘ The scene of pleasure, pomp, and power,
‘ Thou never more shalt be.
‘ To Learmont’s name no foot of earth
‘ Shall e’er again belong;
‘ And on thy hospitable hearth
‘ The hare shall leave her young.
‘ Adieu! adieu!’ again he cried,
All as he turn’d him roun’,
‘ Farewell to Leader’s silver tide!
‘ Farewell to Ercildoune!’ ”

As a contrast to these touching sketches, yet not a little illustrative of them, we may take Sir Walter’s own account of the process by which he was first set on brooding over the Border legends.

“ The local information, which I conceive had some share in forming my future taste and pursuits, I derived from the old songs and tales which then” (when he was first old enough to remember any thing)

“formed the amusement of a retired country family”—his grandmother’s family, to whom he was sent out of Edinburgh to be nursed in his lameness. “My grandmother, in whose youth the old Border depredations were matter of recent tradition, used to tell me many a tale of Wat of Harden, Wight Willie of Aikwood, Jamie Telfer of the Fair Dodhead, and other heroes—merrymen all of the persuasion and calling of Robin Hood and Little John. A more recent hero, but not of less note, was the celebrated *Diel of Little Dean*, whom she well remembered, as he had married her mother’s sister. Of this extraordinary person I learned many a story, grave and gay, comic and warlike.” “The ballad of Hardyknute I was early master of, to the great annoyance of almost our only visiter, Dr. Duncan, the worthy clergyman of the parish, who had not patience to have a sober chat interrupted by my shouting forth this ditty.”—vol. i. p. 17—19.

Such hints as these may give an idea how the Border stories were associated in the poet’s mind with the scenes and amusements of his childhood. But on this head, although for a quotation it be somewhat long, we must add the passage which gives Mr. Lockhart’s impression of what may be called Scott’s early poetical education; for indeed nothing could so strikingly confirm the view above taken of the whole subject.

“He says that his consciousness of existence dated from Sandy-Knowe; and how deep and indelible was the impression which its romantic localities had left on his imagination, I need not remind the readers of *Marmion* and the *Eve of St. John*. On the summit of the crags which overhang the farm-house stands the ruined tower of Smailholme, the scene of that fine ballad; and the view from thence takes in a wide expanse of the district in which, as has been truly said, every field has its battle, and every rivulet its song—

‘The lady look’d in mournful mood,
Look’d over hill and vale,
O’er Merton’s wood, and Tweed’s fair flood,
And all down Teviotdale.’

Mertoun, the principal seat of the Harden family, with its noble groves; nearly in front of it, across the Tweed, Lessudden, the comparatively small but still venerable and stately abode of the Lairds of Raeburn; and the hoary Abbey of Dryburgh, surrounded with yew trees as ancient as itself; seem to lie almost beneath the feet of the spectator. Opposite him rise the purple peaks of Eildon, the traditional scene of Thomas the Rymer’s interview with the Queen of Faerie; behind are the blasted peel which the seer of Erceldoun himself inhabited, the ‘Broom of the Cowden-Knowes,’ the pastoral valley of the Leader, and the bleak wilderness of Lammermoor. To the eastward the desolate grandeur of Hume Castle breaks the horizon, as the eye travels towards the range of the Cheviot. A few miles westward, Melrose, ‘like some tall rock with lichens gray,’ appears clasped amidst the windings of the Tweed; and the district presents the serrated mountains of the Gala, the Ettrick, and the Yarrow,

all famous in song. Such were the objects that had painted the earliest images on the eye of the last and greatest of the Border minstrels.

“ As his memory reached to an earlier period of childhood than that of almost any other person, so assuredly no poet has given to the world a picture of the dawning feelings of life and genius, at once so simple, so beautiful, and so complete, as that of his *Epistle to William Erskine*, the chief literary confidant and counsellor of his prime of manhood.

* * * * *

Thus while I ape the measure wild
Of tales that charm'd me yet a child,
Rude though they be, still with the chime
Return the thoughts of early time.
And feelings rous'd in life's first day
Glow in the line and prompt the lay.
Then rise those crags, that mountain tower,
Which charm'd my fancy's wakening hour.
It was a barren scene and wild,
Where naked cliffs were rudely pil'd ;
But ever and anon between
Lay velvet tufts of loveliest green ;
And well the lonely infant knew
Recesses where the wall-flower grew,
And honeysuckle lov'd to crawl
Up the low crag and ruin'd wall.
I deem'd such nooks the sweetest shade
The sun in all its rounds survey'd ;
And still I thought that shatter'd tower
The mightiest work of human power :
And marvell'd as the aged hind
With some strange tale bewitch'd my mind,
Of forayers who with headlong force
Down from that strength had spurr'd their horse,
Their southern rapine to renew
Far in the distant Cheviots blue,
And home returning fill'd the hall
With revel, wassail rout, and brawl.
Methought that still with trump and clang
The gateway's broken arches rang ;
Methought grim features, seam'd with scars,
Glar'd through the windows' rusty bars ;
And ever, by the winter hearth,
Old tales I heard of woe and mirth,
Of lovers' slights, of ladies' charms,
Of witches' spells, of warriors' arms,—
Of patriot battles won of old
By Wallace Wight and Bruce the Bold—
Of later fields of feud and fight,
When, pouring from their Highland height,

The Scottish clans, in headlong sway,
 Had swept the scarlet ranks away:
 When stretch'd at length upon the floor,
 Again I fought each combat o'er,
 Pebbles and shells, in order laid,
 The mimic ranks of war display'd,
 And onward still the Scottish Lion bore,
 And still the scatter'd Southron fled before."

Will the reader excuse yet a few more sentences? it seems to us that neither the picture nor the argument will be quite so complete without them.

"There are still living in that neighbourhood two old women, who were in the domestic service of Sandy-Knowe, when the lame child was brought thither in the third year of his age. One of them, Tibby Hunter, remembers his coming well, and that he was 'a sweet tempered bairn, a darling with all about the house.' 'The young ewe-milkers delighted,' she says, 'to carry him about upon their backs among the crags;' and he was 'very gleg (quick) at the uptake, and soon kenned every sheep and lamb by headmark as well as any of them.' His great pleasure however was in the society of the 'aged hind' recorded in the epistle to Erskine. 'Auld Sandy Ormistoun,' called, from the most dignified part of his function, 'the cow bailie,' had the chief superintendence of the flocks that browsed upon the 'velvet tufts of loveliest green.' If the child saw him in the morning, he would not be satisfied unless the old man would set him astride on his shoulder, and take him to keep him company as he lay watching his charge.

Here was poetic impulse given
 By the green hill and clear blue heaven.

The cow bailie blew a particular note on his whistle, which signified to the maid servants in the house below when the little boy wished to be carried home again. He told his friend Mr. Skene of Rubislaw, when spending a summer day in his old age among these well-remembered crags, that he delighted to roll about on the grass all day long in the midst of the flock, and that 'the sort of fellowship he thus formed with the sheep and lambs had impressed his mind with a degree of affectionate feeling towards them which had lasted throughout life.' There is a story of his having been forgotten one day among the knolls, when a thunderstorm came on, and his aunt, suddenly recollecting his situation, and running out to bring him home, is said to have found him lying on his back, clapping his hands at the lightning, and crying out, 'Bonny, bonny!' at every flash. I find the following note in his copy of Allan Ramsay's *Tea-Table Miscellany*: 'This book belonged to my grandfather, Robert Scott, and out of it I was taught *Hardyknute* by heart before I could read the ballad myself. It was the first poem I ever learned, the last I shall ever forget.'"—vol. i. p. 79—83.

To the same period, or but a little after it, Sir Walter himself

traces also his seemingly instinctive loyalty to the Stuarts, combined as it appears with as instinctive an hatred of democracy.

“ During the heat of the American war, I remember being as anxious on my uncle’s weekly visits (for we heard news at no other time) to hear of the defeat of Washington, as if I had some deep and personal cause of antipathy to him. I know not how this was combined with a very strong prejudice in favour of the Stuart family, which I had originally imbibed from the songs and tales of the Jacobites. This latter propensity was deeply confirmed by the stories told in my hearing of the cruelties exercised in the executions at Carlisle, and in the Highlands after the battle of Culloden. One or two of our own distant relations had fallen on the occasion, and I remember detesting the name of Cumberland with more than infant hatred. Mr. Curle, farmer at Yetbyre, husband of one of my aunts, had been present at their execution, and it was probably from him that I first heard these tragic tales which made so great an impression on me.”—vol. i. p. 17.

A few years later he records another stage in his poetical education.

“ I then first became acquainted with Bishop Percy’s *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry*. As I had been from infancy devoted to legendary lore of this nature, and only reluctantly withdrew my attention, from the scarcity of materials and the rudeness of those which I possessed, it may be imagined, but cannot be described, with what delight I saw pieces of the same kind which had amused my childhood, and still continued in secret the Delilahs of my imagination, considered as the subject of sober research, grave commentary, and apt illustration, by an editor who showed that his poetical genius was capable of emulating the best qualities of what his pious labour preserved. I remember well the spot where I read these volumes for the first time. It was beneath a huge platane tree, in the ruins of what had been intended for an old fashioned arbour in the garden I have mentioned. The summer day sped onward so fast, that notwithstanding the sharp appetite of thirteen, I forgot the hour of dinner, was sought for with anxiety, and was still found entranced in my intellectual banquet. To read and to remember was in this instance the same thing, and henceforth I overwhelmed my schoolfellows, and all who would hearken to me, with tragical recitations from the ballads of Bishop Percy. The first time, too, I could scrape a few shillings together, which were not common occurrences with me, I bought unto myself a copy of these beloved volumes; nor do I believe I ever read a book half so frequently, or with half the enthusiasm.

“ To this period also I can trace distinctly the awaking of that delightful feeling for the beauties of natural objects which has never since deserted me. The neighbourhood of Kelso, the most beautiful if not the most romantic village in Scotland, is eminently calculated to awaken these ideas. It presents objects not only grand in themselves but venerable from their association. The meeting of two superb rivers, the Tweed and the Teviot, both renowned in song,—the ruins of an ancient

abbey,—the more distant vestiges of Roxburgh Castle,—the modern mansion of Fleurs, which is so situated as to combine the ideas of ancient baronial grandeur with those of modern taste—are in themselves objects of the first class, yet are so mixed, united and melted among a thousand other beauties of a less permanent description, that they harmonize into one general picture, and please rather by unison than by concord. I believe I have written unintelligibly upon this subject, but it is fitter for the pencil than the pen. The romantic feelings which I have described as predominating in my mind naturally rested upon and associated themselves with the grand features of the landscape around me, and the historical incidents, or traditional legends, connected with many of them, gave to my admiration a sort of intense impression of reverence, which at times made my heart feel too big for my bosom. From this time the love of natural beauty, more especially when combined with ancient ruins, or remains of our fathers' piety or splendour, became with me an insatiable passion, which, if circumstances had permitted, I would willingly have gratified by travelling over half the globe." —vol. i. p. 38—40.

These statements, surely, are more than sufficient to strengthen and account for the impression which his writings would create: that his love of chivalrous and legendary lore was originally and essentially *local*: he clung to it as to the feeling of his childhood, and it was inseparably connected in his mind with the love of scenery and of home, and with the sense of loyalty. His romance is not like Homer's, rejoicing in the description of things as he found them, only investing them with a sort of supernatural light: nor like Tasso's, told with solemnity and reverence, as though in fulfilment of a religious vow: nor like Spenser's, the form and garb merely in which the poet clothed his visions of an ideal world, and longings for supernatural perfection. The nearest resemblance, perhaps, is that which Bishop Heber long ago observed and illustrated, viz., between Scott and Pindar: for Pindar also had to go back some ages for his story; he also generally began to work on a ground of real scenery and traditionary genealogy. But the charm derived from association with his own boyhood seems in a great measure peculiar to Scott, and throws around all his performances an atmosphere and colouring of simplicity, short only of that which would have resulted from actual truth.

We were next to specify certain occasions in Scott's life, critically adapted to check yet foster this his longing after legendary lore, till it was just fit, according to our theory, to pour itself out in true poetry. His early lameness, occurring before he could remember any thing, was the very thing, one should have expected, to interfere with his out-door propensities. But it led to his being sent to Sandy Knowe, at such a moment of his life,

that the first sounds he could afterwards well remember were the scraps of Border ballads he was entertained with ; and the first sights were the rocks, ruins, hills, and waters of the Tweed and Teviot. We can also imagine his regarding horses, dogs, and other such accompaniments of the woodland life, with other and more poetical thoughts than would have been natural to him, had he been free to move about like other boys. They would seem to him more like playmates and companions, less like mere instruments of amusement and excitation, in which latter and more vulgar light they are apt to be considered by ordinary sportsmen : a class to which it is probable that Scott would have approached nearer by many degrees, had he enjoyed to the full his natural robust activity. As it was, all his pursuits in that kind were in a manner ennobled by a sense of difficulty overcome, which caused them also to present in his case a truer and more adequate image of that feudal warfare, to which he ever delighted to recur. One of the most characteristic traits in his management of a story, and one which few, we imagine, can have failed to observe, is the manner in which he introduces his dogs, making them really part of the *dramatis personæ*, and almost endowing them with human qualities—as in the *Talisman*, and in the *Lady of the Lake*. He notices himself, as will have been seen, the “sort of fellowship which he early formed with the lambs and sheep.”

We cannot quit this topic of his lameness without adverting to a contrast between him and his contemporary (and as some think his rival) Lord Byron, brought out by this seemingly unimportant circumstance. Lord Byron's infirmity, instead of stimulating him as Scott's did to generous exertion, seems to have been felt by him as a continual incentive to spleen—a thorn in the side of that inordinate vanity, which apparently was always the ruling passion of that unfortunate person. An instance of it is incidentally mentioned in these volumes.

“Will Rose told me that once, while sitting with Byron, he fixed insensibly his eyes on his feet, one of which, it must be remembered, was deformed. Looking up suddenly he saw Byron regarding him with a look of concentrated and deep displeasure, which wore off when he observed no consciousness or embarrassment in the countenance of Rose.”—vol. vi. p. 131.

Such things may seem too trifling to dwell upon ; but men must have watched themselves and others to little purpose, if they have not found that these are the very points on which, if one had the skill to seize them, a whole character often turns. Nor is this the only instance in which, evidently without intention on the part of the biographer, the minds and tempers of the two poets come into contrast with each other, to the great disad-

vantage of Lord Byron, and in a way to give effectual warning against some of the greatest perils to which the poetical temperament is liable.

The *profession* of Sir Walter Scott is another critical circumstance, which might seem at first sight to withdraw him from the region of romance, but which on inquiry we may find to have combined only just that mixture of restraint and indulgence which best forwards the development of the poetical faculty. On this point again we willingly strengthen ourselves by the decided opinion of Mr. Lockhart. After reciting the entry of Scott's apprenticeship from the minutes of the Society of Writers to the signet, he remarks,

"An inauspicious step this might at first sight appear in the early history of one so strongly predisposed for pursuits wide as the antipodes asunder from the dry technicalities of conveyancing; but he himself, I believe, was never heard in his mature age to express any regret that it should have been taken; and I am convinced for my part, that it was a fortunate one. It prevented him, indeed, from passing with the usual regularity through a long course of Scotch metaphysics; but I extremely doubt whether any discipline would have led him to derive either pleasure or profit from studies of that order. His apprenticeship left him time enough, as we shall find, for continuing his application to the stores of poetry and romance, and those old chroniclers, who to the end were his darling historians. Indeed, if he had wanted any new stimulus, the necessity of devoting certain hours every day to a routine of drudgery, however it might have operated on a spirit ever prone to earth, must have tended to quicken his appetite for the sweet bread eaten in secret. But the duties which he had now to fulfil were in various ways directly and positively beneficial to the full development of his genius and his character. It was in the discharge of his functions as a writer's apprentice that he first penetrated into the Highlands, and formed those friendships among the surviving heroes of 1745, which laid the foundation for one great class of his works. Even the less attractive parts of his new avocation were calculated to give him a more complete insight into the smaller workings of poor human nature than can ever be gained from the experience of the legal profession in its higher walk: the etiquette of the bar in Scotland, as in England, being averse to personal intercourse between the advocate and his client. But finally, and I will say chiefly, it was to this prosaic discipline that he owed those habits of steady, sober diligence, which few imaginative authors had ever before exemplified; and which, unless thus beaten into his composition at a ductile stage, even he, in all probability, could never have carried into the almost professional exercise of some of the highest and most delicate faculties of the human mind."—vol. i. p. 132, 133.

It might perhaps not irrelevantly be added, that his legal pursuits afforded greater facilities than almost any other profession

could have done for antiquarian research, the connection of which with romantic poetry has already been touched on, and is too obvious to need much further explanation. In truth, it is the same feeding of fancy on the days gone by, whether a man try to recall them by brooding over their visible and tangible fragments, or by setting down the thoughts they suggest in metrical language. The peculiar sympathy with which Scott evidently regarded such characters (e.g.) as his own Antiquary, is generally, we suppose, felt to be quite in keeping with his proper office and character, as last of the minstrels. It seems as though, if he had not been Walter Scott, he would very contentedly have been Jonathan Oldbuck. The connection of the two pursuits is apparent in other romantic poets, as Warton and Gray, and, if we mistake not, in Spenser also, and in Virgil. Witness the delight which the former evidently takes in reciting the substance of the old Chronicles, in identifying places, and accounting for their names by genealogical and local tradition. Witness again on Virgil's part, that most engaging episode of Evander, and the thousand legendary allusions, mixed up with rural description and precept throughout the Georgics. The stories, indeed, and relics, which formed the framework of the heroic poetry of Greece and Rome—what were they but so many points of antiquarian research, cherishing and developing in its way a certain imaginative longing for the heroic age, no less effectually than did the strains of Ennius, of Pindar, or of Homer himself? Nor do we perceive any reason why the antiquarian pursuits, which at all times so earnestly engage the attention of not a few, both in town and country, should not be referred to the same head, of silent and instinctive poetry. If one were to name the classes of persons most apt to be captivated by those pursuits, and among whom are to be found the most eminent examples of success in them, they would probably be these two: clergymen, of our own or of the Romish persuasion, each in their way fondly hanging over the real or supposed fragments of better times: and lawyers, seizing all opportunities of ideal escape into those feudal ages, to which their professional inquiries are ever bringing them near. Thus much to confirm Mr. Lockhart's remark, that Scott's profession, contrary to first thoughts, may have proved a material aid in the development of his poetical character.

The tendency in the same direction of one part of his domestic history, is too obvious to need more than just mentioning in this place: it has been distinctly owned to by himself in his exquisite lines at the end of the *Lady of the Lake*:

“ Much have I ow'd thy strains in life's long way,
 'Through secret griefs the world has never known,
 When on the weary night dawn'd wearier day,
 And bitterer was the grief devour'd alone :—
 That I o'er-live such woes, Enchantress, is thine own.”

The anxieties here alluded to seem to have accompanied him just far enough to interest his mind, so as nothing else could have done it, in the tales and scenery of the Highlands, and then to have left him free to fall back on the ever fresh recollections of his childhood, and the studies associated therewith ; nor is it easy to conceive adequately the peculiar charm which those studies and recollections must have acquired in his mind, when he had so proved their healing and soothing power. Certain it is, that with all his cheerfulness of heart, and his many projects, he may be said ever after that time to have lived more by memory than by hope. Romance, we should say, was thenceforth his real *passion*, though his *affections* were deeply and abundantly exercised.

On the whole, the three turning points in Sir Walter Scott's personal history, his lameness, his profession as a lawyer, and the disappointment just referred to ;—all of which might seem, in different ways, to tend to interrupt the education which circumstances were giving him as the poet of Border Romance ; the first, as an obstacle to his collecting materials ; the two last, as withdrawing him to other subjects :—all of them are found in effect to have aided in perfecting him for his task.

It were easy to add other circumstances, more obviously of the same tendency : such as his not having travelled. The state of the continent during almost the whole prime of his life, prevented his obeying an instinct which he acknowledges was peculiarly strong in him. Lord Byron, in a too characteristical letter, quoted by Mr. Lockhart, sneers at Scott for not being a travelled man. But surely in the extract just referred to, in which Scott expatiates so affectionately on the scenery about Kelso, the landscape which first attracted him as scenery, we may discern one inestimable advantage, which the very confinement gave to his imaginative energies. Concentrated as they were on one class of objects, they acquired in perfection the art of associating therewith whatever else came before the writer's mind. The print they first took continued throughout fresh and true, to a degree which could not have been expected, had he plunged into totally new scenes at that period of his life.

Another privation which he repeatedly laments was his total want of Greek literature : and yet it may be doubted whether this

also were not in the main a fortunate circumstance, in that it tended to keep his style entirely, exclusively and unaffectedly *romantic*, in the sense in which that word is used by way of opposition to the word *classical*. Had he been familiar with the Greek models, it can hardly be but he must have lost something of the frank military artlessness, which, as we have seen, he himself perceived to be the chief charm of his composition. Who would wish the architect of Canterbury Cathedral to have been deeply versed in the proportions of the four regular orders of Greece?

Such being the instinctive art of this rare genius, that he laid hold of things which seemed at the time most adverse to his chance of success, and turned them into profitable materials and helps of one kind or another; it is no wonder, though not a little amusing and interesting to observe, how he dealt with the several affairs, both of life and literature, as they arose: how easily they were all made to put on the hue of the writer's own mind. His field sports and love of animals, throughout life a feature of his character, and outlasting almost the conscious faculties of his understanding; his eager Toryism at all times, and his peculiar enthusiasm in the yeomanry service during the alarm of the first French war; his mode of life in the flourishing time of his fortunes; his baronial hospitality, all but indiscriminate; his mode of interesting rich and poor mutually in each other's sports; his planting and felling often with his own hand, thereby making for himself and enjoying the sort of mystery which belongs to woodland scenery; perhaps too his uncompromising way of devoting himself for his duty's sake, when he once knew the amount of his pecuniary difficulties; and certainly, and not least, his joining the Church, although bred up in the Kirk, (for it is not in human nature that he should not have been more or less influenced by the association of Church principles with the scenes and parties to which he was so deeply attached:)—all these in their several lines may be considered as so many accommodations, or extensions, of his darling chivalrous taste, to subjects beyond its proper sphere, yet bearing an analogy more or less direct to some part of those with which it was originally conversant. The peculiar charm of all was his entire simplicity. He went through the greater part of his youth with little or no suspicion that his poetical talent was any thing beyond a very common standard. This caused him, with all his love of the Border ballads, to refrain from any imitation of them until 1796, when he was near five and twenty. He himself distinctly states, that "he made no attempts in the manner of the old minstrels, great as his admiration for them had been, until the period of his acquaintance with Bürger,"

(i. 136), whose ballad of Lenore he translated, and on much encouragement published, in the year just mentioned. But from first to last he never seems to have written, spoken, or lived, in any sort of consciousness that he was unlike other men. He was a boy in many respects later in life than most men; and his boyish instincts, the best of them, never forsook him. It was the hardest thing in the world for the admiring "public" to "din it" into him, that something out of the common was always expected from him; and when he did find it out, the discovery seems to have brought far from unmixed gratification: indeed the annoyance he continually felt from that which is the very food of so many authors' vanity, seems to have had no small share in urging him to conceal his authorship of the prose romances. Speaking of the like reserve in the case of the Bridal of Triermain—

"The truth is," he said, "that this sort of muddling work amuses me, and I am something in the condition of Joseph Surface, who was embarrassed by getting himself too good a reputation: for many things may please people well enough anonymously, which, if they have me in the title-page, would give me that sort of ill-name which precedes hanging."

A little afterwards,

"I shall *not* own Waverley; my chief reason is, that it would prevent me of the pleasure of writing again. . . . In point of emolument, every body knows that I sacrifice much money by withholding my name, and what should I gain by it, that any human being has a right to consider as an unfair advantage? In fact, only the freedom of writing trifles with less personal responsibility, and perhaps more frequently than I otherwise might do."—vol. iii. p. 131, 133.

"His object," Mr. Lockhart says, "was above all, to escape the annoyance of having productions, actually known to be his, made the daily and hourly topics of discussion in his presence."—vol. iii. p. 302.

As a different exhibition of the same rare simplicity, we would cite the passages which record his opinion of the Duke of Wellington. When he returned from Paris in 1815, James Ballantyne begged to be informed what was the general impression on his mind. He answered, that "he might now say he had seen and conversed with all classes of society, from the palace to the cottage, and including every conceivable shade of science and ignorance, but that he had never felt awed or abashed, except in the presence of one man, the Duke of Wellington."

"I expressed some surprise. He said, I ought not, for the Duke of Wellington possessed every one mighty quality of the mind in a higher degree than any other man did or had ever done. He said, he beheld in him a great soldier and a great statesman—the greatest of each.

When it was said, that the Duke on his part saw before him a great poet and novelist, he smiled, and said, What would the Duke of Wellington think of a few bits of novels, which perhaps he had never read, and for which the strong probability is that he would not care sixpence if he had."—vol. iii. p. 375.

Mr. Lockhart here remarks,

"I need hardly repeat, what has been already distinctly stated more than once, that Scott never considered any amount of literary distinction as entitled to be spoken of in the same breath with mastery in the higher departments of practical life: least of all with the glory of a first-rate captain. To have done things worthy to be written was in his eyes a dignity to which no man made any approach, who had only written things worthy to be read. He on two occasions, which I can never forget, betrayed painful uneasiness when his works were alluded to as reflecting honour on the age that had produced Watt's improvement of the steam-engine, and the safety-lamp of Sir H. Davy. Such was his modest creed."

The distinguished poets, we suspect, are not many, of whom it might truly be said that they looked on it as a much greater matter to *do poetical things*, than to record them in good verses. Perhaps it might be found that the sentiment was an indication of something primary and original in the poetry of the mind which adopted it.

In truth, it seems to us, that to the complete developement of this part of Scott's character, his single-minded frankness and noble simplicity, the volumes before us owe their main attraction; and a most potent one it is. Before this publication, those who knew nothing of the man might be led to wish and hope from his writings that such was his cast of character, but they could hardly venture to be very sanguine about it; partly on account of the known duplicity of authors, and partly from certain anomalous appearances, to which we shall presently advert more particularly, in the style and conduct of the narratives themselves. But the *Life* puts an end at once to all questionings of the kind. There is throughout a transparency of character, which, if you could bring yourself to suspect, you might next begin finding out plots and intrigues in the careless jollity of a schoolboy. We are thus left free to the full and delightful admiration of the other noble and ingenuous qualities which naturally accompany this open frankness of mind, and which are as discernible as his energy and genius in every part of his correspondence. We have spoken of the unaffected modesty, which caused him to go on so long in ignorance of his own poetical powers. He was twenty-eight, by his own account, before he made any serious attempt in verse. This modesty, joined to his habitual kindness, made him the most indulgent of readers and of critics; he always at-

tributing to the writer himself the bright thoughts which struck him on perusal. Of this a remarkable instance occurs in the anecdote about the origin of the *Minstrelsy*, vol. i. 316, 317.

“ James Ballantyne called on him one morning and begged him to supply a few paragraphs on some legal question of the day for his newspaper. Scott complied, and carrying his article himself to the printing-office, took with him also some of his recent pieces, designed to appear in Lewis's collection. With them, especially, as his memorandum says, the ‘*Morlachian fragment after Goethe*,’ Ballantyne was charmed; and he expressed his regret that Lewis's book was so long in appearing. Scott talked of Lewis with rapture; and after reciting some of his stanzas, said, I ought to apologize to you for having troubled you with any thing of my own when I had things like this for your ear. I felt at once, says Ballantyne, that his own verses were far above what Lewis could ever do, and though, when I said this, he dissented, yet he seemed pleased with the warmth of my approbation. At parting, Scott threw out a casual observation, that he wondered his old friend did not try to get some little booksellers' work, to keep his types in play during the rest of the week. Ballantyne answered, that such an idea had not before occurred to him; that he had no acquaintance with the Edinburgh ‘trade,’ but if he had, his types were good, and he thought he could afford to work more cheaply than town printers. Scott, with his good humoured smile, said, you had better try what you can do. You have been praising my little ballads, suppose you print a dozen copies or so, or as many as will make a pamphlet, sufficient to let my Edinburgh acquaintances judge of your skill for themselves. Ballantyne assented; and I believe exactly twelve copies of *William and Ellen*, the *Fire-King*, the *Chase*, and a few more of these pieces, were thrown off accordingly. . . This first specimen of a press, afterwards so celebrated, pleased Scott; and he said to Ballantyne, ‘I have been for years collecting old Border ballads, and I think I could with little trouble put together such a selection as might make a neat little volume to sell for four or five shillings. I will talk to some of the booksellers about it when I get to Edinburgh; and if the thing goes on you shall be the printer.’ Ballantyne highly relished the proposal, and the result of this little experiment changed wholly the course of his worldly fortunes, as well as of his friend's.”

The above is but one among innumerable traits in these volumes which fully justify the “summing up” of the biographer on this head.

“ The ease with which he did every thing deceived him; and he probably would never have done himself any measure of justice, even as compared with those of his own time, but for the fact, which no modesty could long veil, that whatever he did became immediately ‘*the fashion*’—the object of all but universal imitation. Even as to this he was often ready to surmise that the priority of his own movement might have been matter of accident; and certainly nothing can mark the humility of his mind more strikingly than the style in which he discusses, in his *Diary*, the pretensions of the pigmies that swarmed and fretted

in the deep wake of his mighty vessel. . . . His propensity to think too well of other men's works sprung of course mainly from his modesty and good nature; but the brilliancy of his imagination greatly sustained the delusion. It unconsciously gave precision to the trembling outline, and a life and warmth to the vapid colours before him. This was especially the case as to romances and novels; the scenes and characters in them were invested with so much of the 'light within,' that he would close with regret volumes which perhaps no other person except the diseased glutton of the circulating library, ever could get half through. When colder critics saw only a schoolboy's hollowed turnip with its inch of tallow, he looked through the dazzling spray of his own fancy, and sometimes the clumsy toy seems to have swelled almost into the majesty of buried Denmark."—vol. vii. p. 416.

It was part and parcel of the same modesty that he always undervalued literary fame, as before mentioned, in comparison with eminence attained in more active life. And herein, as in other his maturer opinions, it is curious to trace the temper which caused him, when a boy at Edinburgh High School, to direct his chief efforts towards overcoming the disadvantages of his lameness out of doors, and so on the whole to make "a brighter figure in the yards than in the class."

And thus it is throughout. With that key to his character, which the memoirs of his childhood supply, we are able to account for almost all the great features both of his writings and his life. No where, probably, in biography can be found a completer illustration of Wordsworth's sentiment, "The child is father to the man."

Even those particulars which disclose something more or less to be regretted, either in his sentiments or his habits, generally have in them something akin to his romantic and poetical temperament. Occasionally we find him swearing: there is one letter, indeed, so recklessly profane in that respect, that one wonders how it got inserted in the *Life*: if any sufficient justification exist, surely it should be stated; as it is, the page alluded to is simply shocking. However, even this most lamentable defect is so far to our purpose, as it clearly indicates a mind overcome with some violent but restrained feeling, and seeking a vent for it any how: the very condition, as we speculate, of poetical composition. For without question it is relief in excitement, relief by venting one's self, which tempts men to swear in the first instance, before the crime have become habitual. It can hardly be necessary to add, that this is no more an excuse for that hateful custom, than any other temptation for the sin which it prompts.

The very questionable morality again, of his various disquisitions and narratives about *duelling*, and his own determination, in his old age, to have answered a challenge, if it had come, on a certain occasion, are results probably of devotion, in this respect

idolatrous, to the chivalrous and romantic school of honour. We may well believe, that both in these matters, and in the occasional countenance which he gives to intemperance in drinking, he was, half unconsciously perhaps, but really, seduced in part by the known practices of his favourite clannish times. Nay, and those parts, even of his life and writings, which would seem most irreconcilable with genuine poetical enthusiasm, are in some measure traceable, without undue refinement, to the same master passion—the love of what pleased him when a boy. He did not, indeed, affect to be superior to the love of fame, wealth, and success, but as motives to writing, it is evident they were with him but secondary. And we have seen how in after years his too eager engaging in great schemes of the kind was due, his biographer being judge, to a romantic wish of realizing in himself a sort of feudal or baronial life. This being supposed, will help us to explain the reserve, in other respects so alien to his temper, which he practised towards many even of his intimate friends, in regard both of his commercial engagements and of the authorship of the novels. Men are always more or less reserved in what concerns their ruling passion. Conscious to themselves that the degree of sympathy they will meet with from others is very limited, and afraid of exposing to some sort of rudeness what they seriously prize or revere, they instinctively contrive all sorts of shading, to withdraw ordinary eyes from their real subject. The more they retain of the imaginative playfulness of children, the apter are they to indulge in this kind of half sportive mysteriousness. We cannot but think that this consideration, added to what we before adduced, will go far to explain the secrecy, unaccountable to many, which Scott affected so long to keep up concerning the parentage of *Waverley* and the rest of that family. The poetical mind must have its veil, its mode of reserve after its own fashion: and this was the particular fashion to which Scott's temperament, boyish to the last, inclined him. Again, if Mr. Lockhart is right in imagining that his commercial speculations were mainly prompted by the visionary hope above mentioned, though but half acknowledged to himself, he would feel the same temptation to conceal them, which all sane minds experience in matters wherein their conscience tells them they are obeying imagination rather than reason.

But how shall we explain the apparent *liberalism* of many of his discussions and reflections, so opposite to the youthful and chivalrous tone which we have assumed to be his only natural one? E. g. no one surely who surrenders himself to Scott's influence can avoid feeling as a partisan of the Stuarts; yet he has solemnly declared himself more than once abstractedly in

favour of "the glorious revolution." *Ex cathedra*, he instructs young people to admire those proceedings, which to the end of his life he considered so invalid, as to prejudice the right of the House of Brunswick to the throne, until the death of the Cardinal of York. In like manner much of what he says of the liberty of the press, of the rights of the people, of indifference as to religious systems—is clearly at variance with his impulses on those subjects, as they betray themselves in the more dramatic parts of his writings. Again, we may compare his early horror of Bonaparte, for which Mr. Lockhart has thought necessary to apologise as a weakness, with the bland tone and citizen-like candour which he occasionally assumes in the life of that least of great men, and for which perhaps others, at least as reasonably, may think some apology necessary. Scott himself, on one occasion, declined writing the life of Queen Mary, because, he said, his feelings on that part of history were so much at war with his convictions; and this being so, the question arises, what was the real ground and amount of those convictions? We shall probably have to fall back in reply on some such statement as this:—that while the modern utilitarian and republican views, the views of 1688, were taught him regularly, as to most young people of his time, he was in his own irregular self-education imbibing tacitly far more potent draughts of severer and more obsolete principles, which continued all his life to sway him in secret, though from his natural modesty, his sense of his own imperfect training, and mistrust of his reasoning powers, (it is upon record that he particularly disliked all sorts of argument in conversation)—he never got so far as to embody those principles in a distinct mental statement, much less to inculcate them on others. He continued, therefore, on the abstract points to take as a matter of course the tone which he had received by inheritance, or by intercourse with those who (he supposed) knew better than himself; while in all matters of detail and feeling he was a thorough cavalier, perhaps what would now be called a bigot. In his imaginative works this apparent inconsistency may be numbered among the half-involuntary artifices, by which, according to the instinct of all poets properly so called, he withdraws from the view of those, who will not sympathize, himself and his own depth of interest in his subject. In this point of view his occasional professions of liberalism give somewhat of the same kind of zest to his Tory career, as old sportsmen find in the declarations which we sometimes hear from them, that "they have given up hunting, but their horse would not be controuled whenever they fell in with the hounds in their quiet rides."

If now we have been at all correct in our estimate of Scott's

poetical character, and have truly connected it with his history as a man and as a boy, it surely adds no mean confirmation to the idea that poetry may be a provision of nature, for the relief of overcharged minds by indirect expression. The facts of the case, substantiated as they are, furnish to the theory what surveyors, we believe, call a *base of verification* ; the line ascertained by actual admeasurement coinciding very nearly with that which calculation would lead us to construct. There is a ruling passion—the love of Border Chivalry—distinctly traceable through every variety both of subject and form of composition ; there is an instinctive power and habit of turning every thing to the purposes of that passion ; there is, thirdly, an instinct no less discernible, prompting him unconsciously with different artifices, to veil the taste which engrossed him from those who would not sympathize with or respect it.

Whatever opinion then we might form of some other great names, according to this idea of the art, Scott at least must be set down as a Primary Poet in every sense of the word. Every year proves more decidedly that his popularity was not of the flighty and ephemeral kind ; that the instinctive comparisons with Homer, and Pindar, and Shakspeare, which used to occur to his admirers in their first enthusiasm, had a groundwork in truth and reason. We should not have thought it needful, perhaps, gravely to enunciate such a mere truism, but for the sake of certain prophecies which were uttered in the days of his first reputation as a poet, and which Mr. Lockhart, like a skilful artist, has here brought into vivid contrast with the event. It seems that on the first publication of *Marmion* the following oracle was solemnly uttered, *ex adyto*.

“ Though we think this last romance of Mr. Scott’s about as good as the former, and allow that it affords great indications of poetical talent, we must remind our readers that we never entertained much partiality for this sort of composition, and ventured on a former occasion to express our regret that an author endowed with such talents should consume them in *imitations of obsolete extravagance*, and in the representation of manners and sentiments in which *none of his readers can be supposed to take much interest*, except the few who can judge of their exactness. *To write a modern romance of chivalry seems to be much such a fantasy as to build a modern abbey, or an English pagoda.* For once, however, it may be excused as a pretty caprice of genius ; but a second production of the same sort is entitled to less indulgence, and imposes a sort of duty *to drive the author from so idle a task*, by a fair exposition of the faults which are in a manner inseparable from its execution. His genius, seconded by the omnipotence of fashion, has brought chivalry again into *temporary favour*. Fine ladies and gentlemen now talk indeed of donjons, keeps, tabards, scutcheons, treasures,

caps of maintenance, portcullises, wimples, and we know not what besides: just as they did in the days of Dr. Darwin's popularity, of gnomes, sylphs, oxygen, gossamer, polygynia, and polyandria. That fashion, however, passed rapidly away, and Mr. Scott should take care that a different sort of pedantry does not produce the same effects."—vol. ii. p. 147, *from Edinb. Review for April, 1808.*

And by way of justifying these anticipations, he was accused of having "*throughout neglected Scottish feeling and Scottish characters.*" Truly these literary auguries were a fair match for the political ones which at the same time abounded in the same quarter; and it is instructive, and in some respects consolatory, to think that both failed through an under-estimate of the relics of virtuous feeling, of loyalty and simplicity, in this day of selfish calculation and swaggering intellect. But the political augury, as things then looked, was less discreditable than the critical one to the soothsayer's sagacity.

For the actual result: it is not, perhaps, too much to say, that never did any single writer exert a greater influence on his age. It was no slight benefit, the substitution of his manly realities, both in prose and verse, for the flimsy enervating literature, which, with few exceptions, peopled at that time the shelves of those who read chiefly for amusement. In verse, indeed, he had noble coadjutors towards this most desirable effect, but the reformation of the novel was exclusively his own work; so far at least as that kind of composition comes under the head of poetry, to which title Miss Edgeworth's Tales, whatever their general merit, can hardly be supposed to lay claim.

But it was far more than an improvement in such things, for which this generation is indebted to him. Whatever of good feeling and salutary prejudice exists in favour of ancient institutions, and in particular the sort of rally which this kingdom has witnessed during the last three years, not to say the continuance of the struggle at all through the storm of the preceding—is it not in good measure attributable to the chivalrous tone which his writings have diffused over the studies and tastes of those who are now in the prime of manhood? His rod, like that of a beneficent echanter, has touched and guarded hundreds, both men and women, who would else have been *reforming* enthusiasts. Considering the cold supercilious tone of our age, and the great temptations to utilitarian views, we doubt whether a more remarkable instance ever occurred of the reasonableness of the acute saying, "Give me the making of the ballads of a country, and I will give you the making of its laws." Whether the impulse he has given prevail or no, surely to his writings, humanly speaking, we are mainly indebted for a comparative pause in the career of change on which we had entered: for any opportunity which

may now seem to be afforded us, of surveying and strengthening the bulwarks which yet remain. His biographer has designated him as the "Minstrel of the Anti-Gallican war," and future historians will probably see cause to record his name as that of one timely raised up to educate the youth of England for a crisis like the present. Let us hope that as his poetry has already, in a good degree, superseded the hard misanthropy of Lord Byron, to whom, in his excess of modesty, he used to defer, so the high chivalrous feeling, which he has communicated, may prove a constant glow, not a temporary blaze. It will be much, if it only train some few to a noble and self-denying resistance, when the time shall come for treason and irreligion to throw off the mask which they wear with so ill a grace, and for dry, calculating *conservative* compromise, to retire from what will then be a field of suffering.

But here comes in, we will not say a curious, but a deeply interesting and almost an awful question. What, if these generous feelings had been allowed to ripen into that of which undoubtedly they are the germ and rudiment? What, if this gifted writer had become the Poet of the Church, in as eminent a sense as he was the poet of Border and Highland chivalry? Such a speculation we trust will be found neither irrelevant nor invidious. It is not forced, nor irrelevant, for it comes spontaneously, we will venture to say, into the minds of most readers at all imbued with Catholic principles. While such contemplate Scott's character, whether as recorded in his life or displayed in his writings, the feeling which continually suggests itself is, *cum talis sis, utinam noster esses!* What pity that these good and generous impulses, this energy of self-denial, had not the advantage of being hallowed by devotion to the cause most congenial, the only cause entirely worthy of them! We feel that this one thing, the presence of high Catholic views of religion, is just the thing needed to elevate indefinitely the many noble parts of Scott's *ἦθος*, and to correct the comparatively few points which one would wish quite otherwise.

We will illustrate our meaning: but first, we would deprecate any suspicion of invidious remark on this delicate part of our subject. It cannot be unfair or invidious to point out what we consider defects in the system under which a great writer was brought up, while, at the same time, we acknowledge that he, by mere good sense and good instinct, improved greatly on that system, and attained a point in advance of his own education. While, for the truth's sake, we wish it to be observed how he might have been more perfect, we admire him personally much more for the progress he did make, than we blame him for still falling short of the highest reverential feeling in an irreverent age. For in truth, Sir Walter Scott's position, in respect of religious

truth and duty; was a very disadvantageous one in many respects. His instincts we know early revolted from the strict Calvinism of his father's family; and well it was that he did not contract, as the other great poet of Scotland seems to have done from the same cause, an aversion to all external religion, associated as it came to him with the presumptuous unnatural formulæ of John Knox. He has himself recorded the disgust which he felt at the cold silent funerals of the kirk; and one of his early letters incidentally expresses the like feeling with regard to another part of Presbyterian discipline.—(i. 223.) The danger was of course great, under the actual circumstances of Edinburgh society, that a youth so active in mind, with so few able to appreciate or control him, would break loose from all religious restraint, if not into actual infidelity. It seems as if his deep domestic affections, rather than any peculiar wisdom exercised or influence acquired on the part of those to whom he was intrusted, had been under Providence the instrument of his preservation. He carried about with him in those days family remembrances, as after his death he was found to have accumulated round him family relics.

“ Perhaps the most touching evidence of the lasting tenderness of his early domestic feelings was exhibited to his executors, when they opened his repositories in search of his testament, the evening after his burial. On lifting up his desk, we found arranged in careful order a series of little objects, which had obviously been so placed there that his eye might rest on them every morning before he began his tasks. ‘These were the old-fashioned boxes that had garnished his mother’s toilette, when he, a sickly child, slept in her dressing room: the silver taper stand which the young advocate had bought her with his first five-guinea fee: a row of small packets inscribed with her hand, and containing the hair of those of her offspring that had died before her: his father’s snuff-box, and etui-case; and more things of the like sort, recalling ‘the old familiar faces.’ The same feeling was apparent in all the arrangement of his private apartment. Pictures of his father and mother were the only ones in his dressing-room. The clumsy antique cabinets that stood there, things of a very different class from the beautiful and costly productions in the public rooms below, had all belonged to the furniture of George’s-square. Even his father’s ricketty washing-stand, with all its cramped appurtenances, though exceedingly unlike what a man of his very scrupulous habits would have selected in these days, kept its ground. The whole place seemed fitted up like a little chapel of the *Lares*.’”—vol. vii. p. 411.

Never surely was so ardent an imagination better ballasted by a constant and faithful heart. The result as to his religion is summed up in the following sentences:—

“ Sir Walter received a strictly religious education under the eye of parents, whose virtuous conduct was in unison with the principles they

desired to instil into their children. From the great doctrines thus recommended he appears never to have swerved, but he must be numbered among the many who have incurred considerable risk of doing so, in consequence of the rigidity with which Presbyterian heads of families in Scotland were used to enforce compliance with various relics of the puritanical observance. He took up, early in life, a repugnance to the mode in which public worship is administered in the Scottish establishment, and adhered to the sister Church, whose system of government and discipline he believed to be the fairest copy of the primitive polity, and whose litanies and collects he revered as having been transmitted to us from the age immediately succeeding that of the Apostles. The few passages in his Diaries, in which he alludes to his own religious feelings and practice, show clearly the sober, serene, and elevated frame of mind in which he habitually contemplated man's relations with his Maker; the modesty with which he shrunk from indulging either the presumption of reason, or the extravagance of imagination, in the province of faith; his humble reliance on the wisdom and mercy of God, and his firm belief that we are placed in this state of existence, not to speculate about another, but to prepare ourselves for it by active exertion of our intellectual faculties, and the constant cultivation of kindness and benevolence towards our fellow men."—vol. vii. p. 413.

There is a sound of something like rationalism about this last sentence, and an apparent disavowal of devotion properly so called, little intended, we dare say, by the biographer, and certainly unwarranted, as far as we know, as an expression of Sir Walter Scott's opinions. But with that exception the statement is amply borne out by the notices of feeling and thought on sacred subjects, which are scattered up and down his publications, diary, and letters. Whatever of that kind has dropt from him has this peculiar value, that we are quite sure it was perfectly *undesigned*; it is the oozing out, so to speak, of a full heart; unlike the religious phraseology of many journals, the sincerity whereof there is no cause to question, but it cannot be called *undesigned*, since it is evidently adopted as a matter of duty. The natural deduction in the case before us is, that the few entries which do occur of a religious or devotional kind are infinitely scanty as indications of the degree in which his thoughts were that way exercised. We have observed in particular one entry which demonstrates (if any were inclined to doubt) his habit of regular private devotion. Speaking of a fluttering of the heart, to which he was subject, he says,

"It is an awful sensation, and would have made an enthusiast of me, had I indulged my imagination on devotional subjects. *I have been always careful to place my mind in the most tranquil posture which it can assume during my private exercises of devotion.*"—vol. vi. p. 263.

What a satisfactory light does this sentence throw on the beautiful passage in the *Lady of the Lake*!

“ ‘ I’ll dream no more—by manly mind
Not even in sleep is will resign’d—
My midnight orisons said o’er,
I’ll turn to sleep, and dream no more.’
His midnight orisons he told,
A prayer with every bead of gold,
Consign’d to Heaven his cares and woes,
And sunk in undisturbed repose.”

For other unequivocal indications of unaffected seriousness we would appeal to the notices of his occasional intercourse with Lord Byron. The following passages, if we mistake not, imply more or less a wish on Scott’s part to make the most of any opportunity he might enjoy, for making an impression for good on one, whom he admired for his talents and pitied for the distemperature of his mind, which he, from the beginning, seems to have been aware of. As his manner was, he had formed a much higher opinion than the truth warranted of Lord Byron’s station as a poet in comparison with his own; and when they came to be acquainted, it should seem that this, with his other manly and amiable qualities, caused his lordship to be less unapproachable to him than he was to most others; that Scott, being deeply interested for him, tried to avail himself of this partiality, in order to turn his mind towards better ways of thinking; and that in fact Lord Byron endured more of that kind from him than he commonly would from any one else, and paid him the unconscious but unequivocal compliment of always appearing to him in his best mood. Such are our conclusions: now for extracts to warrant them.

“ Have you seen the *Pilgrimage of Childe Harold*, by Lord Byron? It is, I think, a very clever poem, but gives no good symptom of the writer’s heart and morals; his hero, notwithstanding the affected antiquity of the style in some parts, is a modern man of fashion and fortune, worn out and satiated with the pursuits of dissipation; and although there is a caution against it in the preface, you cannot for your soul avoid concluding that the author, as he gives an account of his own travels, is also doing so in his own character. Now really this is too bad; vice ought to be a little more modest, and it must require impudence, at least equal to the noble lord’s other powers, to claim sympathy gravely for the ennui arising from his being tired of his wassailers and his paramours. * * * Yet with all this conceit and assurance there is much poetical merit in the book, and I wish you would read it.”—vol. ii. p. 394.

This was his original, unbiassed judgment; but his second thoughts savour of his respect for the verdict of others, and still

as Lord Byron mounted higher in popularity, and became what some would call a more formidable rival, Scott, like a true knight, thought and spoke more favourably of him, till at last he came to pronounce him "the only poet we have had since Dryden of transcendant talents" (vol. vii. p. 376); and to assign Byron's having *bet* (surpassed) him as the reason why he left off writing in verse. With this disposition on Scott's part the two poets met, and the following is part of Scott's account of their intercourse.

"Report had prepared me to meet a man of peculiar habits and a quick temper, and I had some doubts whether we were likely to suit each other in society. I was most agreeably disappointed in this respect. I found Lord Byron in the highest degree courteous, and even kind. We met for an hour or two, almost daily, in Mr. Murray's drawing-room, and found a good deal to say to each other. We also met frequently in parties and evening society, so that, for about two months, I had the advantage of a considerable intimacy with this distinguished individual. Our sentiments agreed a good deal, except upon the subjects of religion and politics; upon neither of which I was inclined to believe that Lord Byron entertained very fixed opinions. I remember saying to him that I really thought if he lived a few years he would alter his sentiments. He answered, rather sharply, I suppose you are one of those who prophesy I shall turn methodist. I replied, No. I don't expect your conversion to be of such an ordinary kind. I would rather look to see you retreat upon the Catholic faith, and distinguish yourself by the austerity of your penances. The species of religion to which you must, or may, one day attach yourself, must exercise a strong power over the imagination. He smiled gravely, and seemed to allow I might be right. I think I can add little more to my recollections of Byron. He was often melancholy, almost gloomy. When I observed him in this humour I used to wait till either it went off of its own accord, or till some natural and easy mode occurred of leading him into conversation, when the shadows almost always left his countenance, like the mist rising from a landscape. * * * I met with him very frequently in society; our mutual acquaintances doing me the honour to think that he liked to meet with me. * * * I think I also remarked in Byron's temper starts of suspicion when he seemed to pause and consider whether there had not been a secret and perhaps offensive meaning in something casually said to him. In this case I also judged it best to let his mind, like a troubled spring, work itself clear, which it did in a minute or two. I was considerably older, you will recollect, than my noble friend, and had no reason to fear his misconstruing my sentiments towards him, nor had I ever the slightest reason to doubt that they were kindly returned on his part. If I had occasion to be mortified by the display of genius which threw into the shade such pretensions as I was then supposed to possess, I might console myself that in my own case the materials of mental happiness had been mingled in a greater proportion.

"I rummage my brains in vain for what often rushes into my head

unbidden; little traits and sayings which recall his looks, manner, tone, and gestures; and I have always continued to think that a crisis of life was arrived in which a new career of fame was open to him, and that had he been permitted to start upon it he would have obliterated the memory of such parts of his life as friends would wish to forget."—iii. 337.

To this we may add what Sir Walter Scott once told Captain Hall on this subject (vol. v. p. 402).

"Lord Byron quoted, with the bitterest despair, to Scott, the strong expression of Shakspeare, 'Our pleasant vices are but whips to scourge us,' he added, 'I would to God I could have your peace of mind, Mr. Scott; I would give all I have, all my fame, every thing, to be able to speak on this subject' (that of domestic happiness) 'as you do.'"

The religious principle, moreover, of the reality of which the above extracts, with many others, afford no doubtful indication, was accompanied in Scott by certain predilections and opinions, which require only to be named in order to show what hopeful training he was in for the complete system of the old Catholic Church, could it but have been fully and fairly presented to his mind. We allude in particular to a trait which needs no proof by examples, it is so obvious on the surface of all his most engaging narratives; the love of the marvellous and supernatural, not simply as employing his fancy, but as exercising the principle of faith within him:—his inclination, of the two, to be rather superstitious than unbelieving. This is curiously illustrated by some passages in his life, indicating the sort of pain which he felt, when persons attempted to pry too minutely into accounts of extraordinary appearances and impressions—to draw the exact line between the natural and supernatural. In spite of himself he was continually betraying, that he shrank from the rude and irreverent dealings of modern minute philosophy on topics of that kind.

"On the subject," says Mr. Adolphus, "commonly designated as the marvellous, his mind was susceptible, and it was delicate. He loved to handle them in his own manner and in his own season, not to be pressed with them, or brought to any thing like a test of belief or disbelief respecting them. There is, perhaps, in most minds, a point more or less advanced, at which incredulity on these subjects may be found to waver. Sir W. Scott, as it seemed to me, never cared to ascertain precisely where this point lay in his own mental constitution; still less, I suppose, did he wish the investigation to be seriously pursued by others. In no instance, however, was his colloquial eloquence more striking than when he was well launched in some 'tale of wonder.' The story came from him with an equally good grace, whether it was to receive a natural solution, to be smiled at as merely fantastical, or to take its chance of a serious reception."—vol. vii. p. 59.

It seems plain that the mind here disclosed would have welcomed

the opinions of the early Christian times, as earnestly as it rejected the modern Genevan metaphysics. The tenets of the presence of good and evil angels, of the power of sacramentals, of communion with the faithful departed, in short, the whole of the high doctrine concerning the Holy Catholic Church and the Communion of Saints, had it been fairly presented to him unincumbered of Romanism, would have found ready entrance into a willing mind. The severe simple majesty and richness of the full apostolic ritual would as surely have attracted him, as he was disgusted by the overstrained fancies of ultra-Protestants. Take, e. g. his opinions on psalmody, vol. iii. p. 25.

“ I think those hymns which do not immediately recall the warm and exalted language of the Bible, however elegant, rather cold and flat for the purposes of devotion. You will readily believe that I do not approve of the vague and indiscriminate Scripture language which the fanatics of old and modern Methodists have adopted, but merely that solemnity and peculiarity of diction which at once puts the reader and hearer upon his guard as to the purpose of the poetry. To my gothic ear, indeed, the *Stabat Mater*, the *Dies Iræ*, and some of the other hymns of the Catholic Church, are more solemn and affecting than the fine classical poetry of Buchanan; the one has the gloomy dignity of a gothic Church, and reminds us instantly of the worship to which it is dedicated; the other is more like a Pagan temple, recalling to our memory the classical and fabulous deities.”*

It appeared on his very death-bed how deeply these associations had sunk into him, (vol. vii. 391.)

“ His mind, though hopelessly obscured, seemed to be dwelling, when there was any symptom of consciousness, on serious and solemn things; the accent of the voice grave, sometimes awful, but not querulous, and very seldom indicative of any angry or resentful thoughts. . . . Commonly what we could follow him in was a fragment of the Bible, (especially the Prophecies of Isaiah and the Book of Job,) or some petition in the Litany—or a verse of some Psalm, (in the old Scotch metrical version,) or of some of the magnificent hymns of the Romish ritual, in which he had always delighted, but which probably hung on his memory now in connection with the Church services he had attended while in Italy. We very often heard distinctly the cadence of the *Dies Iræ*; and I think the very last stanza that we could make out was the first of a still greater favourite :

“ *Stabat Mater dolorosa
Juxta crucem lachrymosa,
Dum pendebat Filius.*”

(It will be remembered that his first great poem, and that in which he most pours himself out, ends with a translation of the *Dies Iræ*.)

* Compare Life of Dryden, p. 342, 2d edition.

In all this, (to borrow the powerful language of Burke) we seem to discern "the reachings and graspings" of a natural piety, deep and practical in itself, and therefore manly and sober in its expression, often striving to feel its way out of the unnatural confinement in which it was educated, but not well discerning in what direction to emerge. Situated as Scott was, we may and must regret, but we cannot severely censure, that inadequate sense of the religion of holy places, and of the appointed means of grace and Catholic communion, which permitted him, not occasionally, but as part of his settled plan of life, to substitute, during great part of the year, his own reading in his dining-room for the regular offices of the Church: we can allow for the unfavourable notion which he seems in general to have entertained of the Anglican clergy; of which class, as far as we recollect, he has not produced a single good specimen in all his novels from *Kenilworth* to the *Antiquary*: we feel no surprise at his incredulity about the austerer parts of Catholic practice: we can understand how, without any thing like settled perverseness of heart, he might take liberties with the words of Holy Scripture. In this last remark we do not so much refer to the *verata questio* concerning the over-correct imitation of the Puritan sermons and conversations in "*Old Mortality*," but rather to the irreverent introduction of Scripture phrases in familiar talk and correspondence, which, it is too plain from Scott's letters, and still more from some of those addressed to him, was practised among them as a matter of course. Painful as such expressions are, they are almost sure to be adopted, more or less unconsciously, even by persons who have no irreverent meaning, in a country where it is a part of religion to talk much of holy things, and to be fluent in quoting the most sacred words. It is in short the extreme Protestant rule of dispensing with all reserve about the Scriptures—such reserve as was religiously practised in the ancient Church,—to which we attribute in great measure this grievous blot in a style otherwise so delightful.

Assuredly it arose not from general want of deliberate veneration for the Bible. "His Sunday talk with his children," says Mr. Lockhart, "was just such a series of biblical lessons as that which we have preserved for the permanent use of rising generations, in his '*Tales of a Grandfather*,' on the early history of Scotland. I wish he had committed that other series to writing too: how different that would have been from our thousand compilations of dead epitome and imbecile cant! *He had his Bible, the Old Testament especially, by heart.*" When during his illness he first awoke from a sort of stupor of days and weeks continuance, "he expressed a wish that I should read to him: and

when I asked from what book? he said, '*Need you ask? There is but one.*' I chose the 14th chapter of St. John's Gospel; he listened with mild devotion, and said when I had done, 'Well, this is a great comfort: I have followed you distinctly, and I feel as if I were yet to be myself again.' A little after, we find that, while he had completely forgotten his favourite passages, from Crabbe for instance, "his recollection of whatever was read from the Bible appeared to be clear and lively; and in the afternoon, when we made his grandson, a child of six years, repeat some of Dr. Watts's hymns by his chair, he seemed also to remember them perfectly. That evening he heard the Church service, and when I was about to close the book, said, 'Why do you omit the Visitation for the Sick?' which I added accordingly:" another instance of his sober love of the Liturgy.

It is not, therefore, on Sir Walter himself that we charge any of these deficiencies in Catholic *ἡθος*, or the occasional concessions to Liberalism, by which they are accompanied; but rather on the cast and tone of religious opinion which prevailed where his lot was cast: and does it not still widely prevail? We have no right nor desire to complain of the individual: but we do and must complain of a system, which, disparaging the means of grace and the glory of God's visible kingdom, and disregarding the prime law of reverential reserve, rejected those noble impulses which the primitive Catholic system would have developed and sanctified. We do consider it a sorrowful thing, that the eye of such a mind should never have rested on the true form of the City of God; "*quæ si oculis ejus cerneretur, mirabiles amores excitaret.*" What might have resulted in the way of poetry, or poetical narrative, had things been otherwise ordered, we can but faintly imagine.

Only we would fain, before concluding, enter our protest against the suspicion, not unlikely to occur to many, that there was a cold ideality in the plan of the primitive Church, a severe calmness in her tone of sentiment, which would have taken away the charm from romantic poetry, by precluding the writer from the free exercise of sympathy and imagination. The very contrary is the truth. As the Church herself is the only system, which, according to her title Catholic, comprehends all people, nations and languages; so the poet of the Church, if ever such an one should arise, will find neither feeling nor condition, in human life or in the works of God, beyond his reach or without his province. The hand of our great minstrel would not have been cramped—believe it not—by such a guiding spirit: but his touch in many cases would have been steadier, and his expression more decided, as being sure that he was striking the right note. You would

have felt throughout that the writer was sure he was telling substantial truth : which, after all, is the charm of charms to all men. Nor is this altogether visionary. A living writer, Manzoni, has shown what interest may be communicated to a romance on true Church principles, by powers of a high order indeed, but very deficient in the resource and brilliancy of Scott.

Perhaps, however, it is hardly to be expected that a Catholic Homer or Shakespeare should ever arise. It might almost seem to be ordained, that the master minds of poetry should not be cast on those times and places, where the Church, the only perfect mould to form them in, exists in any thing near its original lustre. As perfect kings, so perfect poets, are hardly to be found in her annals : as though it were intended she should work her way still by instruments comparatively mean and unworthy, and never be tempted to transfer the glory from herself, or rather from Him with whom she is instinct, to any even of her most favoured children.

“ *Privatus illi census erit brevis,
Commune, magnum.*”

Or, if we may without irreverence so apply even sacred words, it may be as well that in this respect also none of her children should believe “ that aught of the things which he possesses is his own,” or the property of any individual besides, but that all should have “ all things common :” that whatsoever is done in God’s household, and for God’s cause, may be evidently done by God’s wisdom and not by man’s.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

MR. JACOBSON'S Edition of the Epistles of St. Clement, St. Ignatius, and St. Polycarp, lately published, we suppose, to be the commencement of an undertaking on the part of the Oxford press, which was reported to be in agitation some years since, of editing a number of the works of the Fathers. The University is fortunate indeed, if the editions which follow are executed with one half the pains and critical skill which Mr. Jacobson has evidently taken with this.

Dr. Pusey's Edition of the Original Text of St. Austin's Confessions is just published, as well as his Translation of the same Work, and the Translation of St. Cyril's Catechetical Lectures. Much pains seem to have been bestowed upon all of them. A most elaborate and instructive account of the Manichean tenets is added to the Translation of the Confessions. Dr. Pusey's arduous work having now at length commenced, we trust that no obstacles will lie in the way of its regular progress.

We are indebted to Mr. Dowling for one of the most important works to a theological student which has appeared for a long time, "An Introduction to the Critical Study of Ecclesiastical History" (Rivingtons.) It consists of the list of historians of the Church down to the present day, and an Essay upon the sources of Ecclesiastical History generally. The work is the more important, as we cannot but hope we see in it the augury of some more extended and methodical attention to this great subject, than has ever been paid it in our Reformed Church. Mr. Dowling at least has begun at the foundation, and that alone is an omen of a superstructure.

Mr. Dowling's work commenced in the pages of the *British Magazine*; a publication which, more than any of the day, has been successful in bringing churchmen together, making them feel confidence in each other, and giving occasion to works some of which at least would not otherwise have been written. Dr. M'Caul's instructive Sketches of Judaism and the Jews, which has just been published in a separate form, is another instance of the last mentioned service.

A series has commenced of most interesting reprints from the works of some divines of the 16th century, under the title of "Tracts of the Anglican

Fathers." Those which we have seen are "Cranmer's Sermons on Holy Baptism;" on "the Apostolical Succession and the power of the Keys;" on the "Blessed Sacrament of the Altar;" and on "the Gifts of the Holy Ghost in the Holy Catholic Church." If the series continues as it has begun, it will exercise an important influence on the theological points at present in controversy.

Mr. Parkinson's instructive Hulsean Lectures (Rivingtons) have a value even beyond their intrinsic worth, as indicating and promoting the advancement of ethical studies at Cambridge. They are intended to show that the doctrines of the Gospel are but the great conclusions to which the phenomena of this world tend; "that their specific defects are exactly such as meet with their specific remedies in the very revelation which we possess; that they stop short just where revelation begins; and that it appears by the deficiency on the one side being exactly met by the sufficiency on the other, that they each form part of one harmonious plan, and were originally designed by the artificer of that plan to be united together for the great end of furthering the moral advancement of man." Accordingly he brings the testimony of ethical philosophy, of the intellectual powers, of the human body, of man as related to external things, to his fellow men, and to himself. It is curious, as a coincidence, that the same subject has lately, as our pages have shown, been discussed, independently of Mr. Parkinson, by Mr. Woodgate and Mr. Oakeley. The subject is most important.

A third edition has appeared of Mr. Miller's well known Bampton Lectures.

Mr. Faber has published an Inquiry into the History and Theology of the ancient Vallenses and Albigenses, (Seeley and Burnside,) which is conducted, as might be expected, with the research and vigour which are the usual characteristics of his works.

Mr. Townsend, the Master (we believe is his title) of the Peculiar of Allerton, has published a charge, which, were we his enemies, we should delight in seeing run to the "fifth thousand." It is written *against* speaking with reserve to the world at large on the more sacred subjects of religion! The style is as extraordinary as the matter. In any one else it would be pompous. It is not so in Mr. Townsend. It is his own style.

Mr. Vernon Harcourt's Doctrine of the Deluge (Longman) is a work of much ingenuity in its design, and most elaborate research in its execution. Its object is to vindicate the Scripture account "from the doubts which have recently been cast upon it by geological speculations;" and he does so, by setting out to show that the Noachical deluge was the type of the doctrines of "expiation of past guilt" and "regeneration," that it is attested by "evidences im-

pressed not upon the surface of the earth, but upon the memory of its inhabitants, and derived from their traditions, their superstitions, their monuments, and their usages," and that "the doctrine which it inculcated was kept alive obscurely in various parts of the world, till it was finally enlisted in the service of true religion, and obtained a permanent place in the institutions of Christianity, and was consigned to holier purposes and endowed with a more operative practice and exalted to the dignity of a Sacrament." In a word, he proves the fact and doctrine to come under the "*quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus.*" "Ever since," he says, "the family of Noah issued forth into the air and light of a new life, and stepped once more upon the renovated earth now cleansed from its former guiltiness by the waters of the deluge, the providence of God had so overruled the superstition thence arising, that a notion of some mystical regeneration by water and expiation of sin had been kept alive among all the nations, with whose history we are well acquainted; and thus the world was prepared to receive that doctrine of a moral regeneration by baptism and forgiveness of sins, which is the commencement of a new life to every Christian." There is an important chapter at the end, on the view of the early Church concerning the regenerative power of baptism, in which Mr. Harcourt nobly upholds our Church's doctrine and the authority of the Fathers against the schools of the 16th century. "The nearer," he says, "we ascend to the fountain head, the purer will the waters flow; the three first centuries therefore after the Apostles were more likely to know in what sense the Apostles themselves used a theological term, *than any three centuries that have since elapsed.* I do not say that they are free from error, or that any uninspired writers are absolutely safe authorities for doctrine: but *they are unexceptionable witnesses to a mere matter of fact*; and in the present instance the fact with which we have to do is this: were the first converts to Christianity in the habit of considering baptism equivalent to regeneration, and necessarily attended with some spiritual grace, or were they not?" What can be desired clearer or more sensible than this? Mr. Harcourt considers Antiquity to supply the *comment* on the text of Scripture.

Dr. Shuttleworth has taken the opposite side, in a little work (Rivingtons) either on "Not Tradition but Scripture," or on "Not Tradition but Revelation," we are not certain which; for the title-page promises the one, and the body of the work undertakes the other. The advertisements have given both. This, we consider, will perplex editors some centuries hence. We hope we are not uncandid to Dr. Shuttleworth, when we say, that this ambiguity at starting is no unfair symbol of the whole production. For instance, he says, that "the great leading principle of Protestantism" is "the entire *sufficiency* of Scripture, independently of tradition, as a rule of faith and doctrine." Sufficiency for *what*? teaching or proving? for the persons Dr. Shuttleworth writes against do not dispute the proposition as he words it. However, in spite of this defect, we rejoice to say, what no one could ever doubt in a work of Dr. Shuttleworth's,

that, unlike some other controversialists, who shall be nameless, he uses much courtesy of language towards his opponents. He even extends it to the ancients. He calls St. Irenæus, for instance, "the good Father," "this good and singleminded man," and "with more honest simplicity than soundness of sense or accuracy of logic" in his arguments. We wish, in turn, to be as courteous to Dr. Shuttleworth. Mr. Holden (Rivingtons) has written a work on the same subject, which we prefer. We do not agree with him, but he sees the difficulties of the subject. All is plain and easy to Dr. Shuttleworth.

The Bishop of Oxford has just published his Charge, which will be read with much interest. The most remarkable part of it is the energetic protest which it enters against the Board of Ecclesiastical Commissioners, "a power," his Lordship says, "as irresponsible as it is gigantic, an imperium in imperio, which, before long, must supersede all other authority in the Church, and whose decrees are issued in such a manner as to render expostulation and remonstrance unavailing." The Charge is also remarkable as giving judgment upon the Tracts for the Times. This is a memorable precedent, and shows what lies before us. *The Church is resuming her judicial power.* We only wish that *other parties* may defer to her as frankly as would, we feel assured, the writers of the above-mentioned Tracts were there a call made on them.

Sermons by the late Rev. John Marriott (Hatchard) are a collection of earnest, serious, practical Discourses, made still more impressive by the circumstances of their publication. They are especially valuable at this moment, as showing that religious views lately put forward, which many persons would represent to be an innovation on received doctrine, are not only to be found in our divines of the seventeenth century, but even in the popular sermons of divines of the generation immediately before us. We direct attention to the sermon on the Danger of Schism.

Mr. Butt has lately published a volume of Sermons, occasioned, as he tells us in the Preface, by Mr. Keble having said that the view of Gospel Truth given by Mr. Butt, in his Strictures upon Mr. Keble's Visitation Sermon, was such as might "be literally accepted by an Arian or a Sabellian." We do not believe that Mr. Keble had any intention of saying that Mr. Butt's views were Arian or Sabellian; far from it; but that the theory he was in his Pamphlet advocating against Mr. Keble, had actually involved him in the necessity of so attenuating his statement of fundamental truth, that an Arian or Sabellian might agree with that particular statement, as far as it went. And so far we must say we agree with Mr. Keble; but we should be sorry to seem to say more, against so highly respectable a clergyman. Mr. Butt ought, we think, to have quoted Mr. Keble's words. They are as follows:—"May it not be taken as an indication of the *tendency* [sic] of the theory, that the list of fundamentals, offered in exemplification of it, includes no express affirmation of the doctrine just mentioned? [that of the Holy Trinity.] Is it not a test which

might be accepted, as far as the letter of it goes, by an Arian or Sabellian? And this consideration is more serious, *the more entirely we are convinced of the orthodoxy and judgment of the person drawing up such a confession.* So much the stronger does the argument become, &c."—*Postscript*, p. 47.

Plain Parochial Sermons, by Rev. Daniel Parsons, (Rivingtons,) are written on a very sound view of doctrine, and in an easy popular style. There is, however, a want of maturity, or we might even say, in a certain sense, of reality, which perhaps is unavoidable in the writings of a young man, as the author seems to be. It is encouraging, however, to find the younger clergy speaking in the tone of Mr. Parsons.

Single Sermons, published as they are commonly at the request of bishops and clergy, or of numbers of clergy, are perhaps as good a test as can be of the feelings uppermost in the mind of the clergy, or what in mathematical language may be called their *differentia* at the time. Those which we have fallen in with give a most satisfactory result, as their titles will show; and we name some of them as well for that reason as for their intrinsic excellence. Such are Mr. Vogan's Sermon, "The Doctrine of the Apostolical Succession developed and proved;" Mr. Fulford's Assize Sermon, "The Interpretation of Law and the Rule of Faith;" Mr. Woodhouse's, on "that Branch of the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church to which we belong;" and Mr. Maurice's, on "The Responsibilities of Medical Students."

We must draw especial attention to a learned sermon of Mr. Manning's, at Chichester, on the Rule of Faith, which contains a great deal of matter and much useful theological information; and a beautiful sermon of Mr. Christie's, at Gloucester.

Mr. Baxter's Sermon, on Scripture Knowledge the Source of National Stability, is excellently principled, as far as its subject leads it to state principles.

"Laud and Leighton," a sermon by Mr. Mortimer, is written in an excellent spirit. He considers that there are two schools in our Church, of which those two archbishops are the respective representatives. Are there then no Kenns and Hammonds on the side of Laud? Is all the meekness gone off with Leighton to the Record, Christian Observer, the Dublin Statesman, and Mr. Townsend?

But of all the single sermons during the last quarter none is to be compared in importance with Dr. Hook's Sermon before the Queen, which, having since delivering gone through so many editions that we have left off counting them, is the most remarkable instance in our time of a religious protest made to high and low, rich and poor. And the plainness and clearness of its statements make it just the sort of composition which should have such a destiny.

Mr. Wilberforce's *Essay on the Parochial System* (Rivingtons) gained the premium of the Christian Influence Society. Little as we like the principle of that Society, we feel much satisfaction in finding it recognizing and approving the sentiments put forward in this little work. It is the plain, serious, clear, and most impressive appeal of a sound Churchman to Englishmen to exert themselves for the increase of the Parochial System up to the present state of our population. Under the circumstances of its publication, we suppose it will be largely circulated, else we should recommend it to the attention of the reader.

Would this same Society had done as well in the prizes awarded to another subject! There is a passage in one of them, which, though not uncommon in this day, is rank Apollinarianism, and gives sad and anxious warning of the (unconscious) growth of heresy among us. The author says, "*Deity dying in the flesh as the commutation for man's eternal punishment.*" In like manner the author of *Essays on the Church*, in a new edition of his work, avows Nestorianism, and, we are sorry to say, involves in his implicit heresy others besides himself. "The Christian Knowledge Society," he says, "has latterly erased from one of its publications the phrase 'the Mother of God,' rightly judging it to be Popish." It is easy plausibly to account for such mistakes in the individual instances, but, we may depend on it, there is a more serious leaven at work at bottom.

We welcome with much satisfaction a reprint of Wogan on the *Proper Lessons*, (Cowie,) a work of a very primitive cast, and full of instructive matter. It is truly a Church of England book. We think our readers will not be sorry to have their attention called to it.

"*Plain Conversations concerning the Church of England*" is a series of dialogues between a clergyman and one of his farmers, on the Church contrasted with Romanism and Dissent. It is written on the soundest principles and with a good deal of careful research, and is well adapted to give instruction on the important subject it handles.

An unpretending volume of poems has made its appearance, consisting of "*Translations from the Lyric Poets of Germany*," by Mr. Macray, (Black and Armstrong). They show a good deal of poetical taste, and a power of easy versification.

No. LXXXIII. of *Tracts for the Times* has appeared under the title of "*Advent Sermons on Antichrist.*"

A pleasing little book has just appeared, called "*A Voice from the Tomb*" (Longman). It is a sort of lament over the existing state of things; it abounds in beautiful Catholic sentiments, and will interest a great many persons.

A "Companion to the Book of Common Prayer" (Low) is a useful analysis of its contents, with a view of adapting it to private or social devotion.

An instructive Pamphlet written by a Dissenter has reached a second edition, called "What! and who says it?" (Ward). It is to show the coincidence of judgment about the Anglican Church, between Mr. Binney, who thinks that it has destroyed more souls than it has saved, and Dr. Chalmers, &c. &c.

We are very sorry to have to allude again to Dr. Hampden, but the present letter, addressed to a contemporary Magazine, as bearing upon the theological views of the late Mr. Davison, claims a place in our pages.

" TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

" SIR,—I presume to trouble you in consequence of a paragraph in a published letter from Dr. Hampden, the Regius Professor of Divinity in Oxford, to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, in which Dr. Hampden states that 'the late Mr. Davison, the highly gifted and excellent author of the "Discourses on Prophecy," had both read and expressly approved his Bampton Lectures.'

" I have the best reason for believing that Dr. Hampden is mistaken in his impression upon the subject. I was never absent from Mr. Davison but for one short interval after the period of the publication of those Lectures, and am well satisfied they were not read by him. Mr. Davison never mentioned the work to me, with approbation or otherwise: and I possess the presentation copy, received in August, 1833, which was *uncut* at the time of Mr. Davison's removal from me, with the exception of *two leaves*; and it remained so till the year 1836, when it was seen by several friends in its unopened state.

" I have thought it hard upon me, and upon the friends of Mr. Davison, that his name should, at a distant period, be implicated in the controversy arising out of these Lectures; and under the circumstances, I felt it to be due to his memory to ask of Dr. Hampden his authority for the assertion contained in the letter to the Archbishop; but to my surprise and mortification, I have had from him a *positive and final refusal*. I am therefore obliged to take the only means within my reach of relieving Mr. Davison from the responsibilities in which Dr. Hampden has involved his name.

" I shall feel obliged to you to give this letter a place in your CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER for the following month.

" I have the honour to be, Sir, your very obedient humble servant,

" MARY DAVISON."

" College Green, Worcester, 7th August, 1838."

We think it may interest the reader to have a few remarks set before him on the State of Theological Literature at this time in Germany. If we may judge by the space which it occupies in their periodical publications, the discussion caused by Dr. Strauss's late work still excites great interest in that country. Most of our readers are probably aware that this work consists of a critical examination of our Saviour's life, which ends in his

reducing those events which he considers to be based on historical truth to a most meagre outline, and treating as mythical and legendary all those sacred facts on which are built the faith and hope of a Christian. We do not propose to put either ourselves or others to pain, by entering into the nature of Dr. Strauss's theory in detail, but only to make two or three remarks on the general subject, and on the mode in which the controversy is being carried on.

If his views were a mere individual extravagance, they might well be left unnoticed, but it seems to be allowed by many of his countrymen, that they are symptomatic of the tendency of their modern theology, and do but embody its inevitable results. To us it certainly appears that the germ of Dr. Strauss's work lay in such productions as Schleiermacher's essay on the Gospel of St. Luke, only he has had the boldness to extend to the whole history those principles which had before been applied to its outset. And we think we can trace a half-consciousness of this in the minds of that section of German writers who seem to have felt themselves more especially called upon to meet the work in question, and who have done so the most elaborately.

In one of a series of Polemical Tracts, which Dr. Strauss has begun in defence of his work, he divides his opponents into three classes;—the Pietists, or those who believe the Scriptures to be divinely inspired, and that their truth must be received in faith, not submitted to criticism; the pure Rationalists; and an intermediate School, who, proceeding on a supernatural basis, give a large license to criticism in details. As regards their opinion of the matter before us, the first and second classes are easily dismissed. The former considers that the truth of the sacred volume approves itself at once to the spiritual mind, and that not to accept it unreservedly is a moral transgression, to be met by reproof rather than argument. The latter hail all speculation whatever as the only mode whereby truth, hitherto undiscovered, can be evolved. But the third class, which forms, we apprehend, the chief portion of the German learned world, and may not unfairly be taken as the representative of the tone of their Theology, have not so compendious a mode of dealing with the subject. They have given up the possibility of defending every thing in Scripture as literally and historically true; they have admitted the *mythical* principle of interpretation; so that they are obliged to go into the subject, and vindicate each event, which they consider as real, from the grasp of this tide, the floodgates of which they have themselves set open, and which they now find advancing upon them. Whether they will succeed in this attempt; whether they will be able to show that the mythical principle may be admitted, yet the fundamentals of the Gospel-history maintained in their integrity,—that many of the Old Testament miracles, and some of the New, may be given up without detriment to the remainder, is still sub judice. Meanwhile, what a strange and saddening thought it is, that in a neighbouring country the science, which so intimately concerns us, should be in so undetermined a state that the professors of it should feel themselves obliged, on the appearance of every new theory, to lay aside their ordinary studies, and to hasten to its examination; that there should be nothing placed out of the reach of discussion,

no question which may not be re-opened and investigated! What an impediment it must be to the acquisition of learning, what a constant source of labour and anxiety to the disputants, and of excitement and instability to all! And from this thought the mind naturally proceeds to another. Must there not be something radically wrong in a system which affords scope for such extravagances? and what (over and above differences of national character and the like) is our own safeguard against such evils? And when we consider that the fundamental difference between us appears to lie in this—that whereas they contemplate the Bible as a self-dependant and isolated fact, it has been placed in our hands with an accompanying guarantee and testimony of its truth, and its great outlines have been arranged, defined, and fixed for us in the creeds and services of the Church. And if this be so, we cannot but feel apprehension that without this safeguard, that elaborate structure of external and internal evidences, which was raised with such care in the last century, would avail but little against the assaults of scepticism; that whether they furnish in their result proofs intellectually-conclusive or no, they would never lead to practical conviction. This consideration should make us thankful for the blessings we of this country enjoy in the Apostolical Church; and we would suggest to those, who, yielding to none in their devotion to the Sacred Scriptures, nay, making such devotion their peculiar watch-word, are disposed to look with jealousy on the upholders of what has been well called “Transmissive Religion,”—whether these last are not in fact fighting their battle for them, only on ground more advantageous than they could themselves occupy? What we mean is, that the spirit which in Germany attacks and questions the authority of Scripture and the credibility of its contents, is one and the same with that which at home impugns the authority of Catholic antiquity, and rejects the doctrines of which it is the witness. And further, that the only solid and convincing arguments for the former, have equal force and applicability to the latter; and could they be overthrown in this latter case, and the doctrines which rest upon them discredited, it would only be a signal for a similar attack upon the canon and contents of Scripture itself.

INDEX

OF THE

REMARKABLE PASSAGES

IN THE

CRITICISMS, EXTRACTS, AND ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

A.

Æschylus, little satisfactorily known respecting him, 424.

Agitation, political and religious, 257, 258.

American Revivals, observations on them, 195, 196.

American Revolution, remarks on it, 150
—the constitution of the Congress, 151, 152—tyranny of the majority, 160, 161.

Anglo-Catholicism, its territorial extent, 359.

Animal Magnetism, its progress in the present day, 301—spirit in which inquiries respecting it should be undertaken, 302—main facts asserted by the present Professors of this science, 309—different stages of phenomena, 310—Christian view of this question, 313, 346—separation of mind from sensation, 314—state of the mind during the suspension of sensation, 324—principal function of the organs of sense, *ib.*—case of epilepsy, 327—animal magnetism perfectly reconcilable with known facts, 331—a species of inebriation, *ib.*—the phenomena not peculiar to magnetism, *ib.*—degrees of *lucidity*, 332—case recorded by M. Du Potet, 336—changes in the theory of magnetism, 342—quackery of it in the present day, 345.

Aristophanes, design and excellence of his writings, 25, 26—the “*Clouds*,” 33.

Aristotle, his ethical works carefully studied at Oxford, 2—their excellence, *ib.*

VOL. XXIV.

—his system contrasted with Plato's, 4, 5, 21, 22—his notion of the essence of poetry, 428, 435.

Articles of the Church, no standard expositor of them, 347.

Associations, religious, abuses and evils of some of them, 254.

Athenian democracy, Plato and Aristophanes aim at reforming it, 12, 25—its composition and tendency, 26, 27, 28.

Augustine (St.), his opinion of Plato's writings, 3—Alexander Knox's opinion of the peculiar value of his works, 83—utility of his “*Confessions*,” 249, 250—accounts of cases of exstasis, 335, 337.

Authority, the deference which is due to it, 58, 59.

B.

Bacon (Lord Chancellor), his character of Plato, 3.

Balaam, his prophetic visions, 327.

Baptism of infants and adults, 109.

Barrow (Dr. Isaac), on *Justification*, 101—on the infrequent use of that term by the Fathers, 115.

Barter's autobiography, very valuable, 250.

Belief, grounds of, 51.

Bingham's Antiquities, observations on the character of this work, 347.

Biography, necessary imperfections of, 423.

Bishops, their missionary functions in the Primitive Church, 120.

K K

Bridgewater Treatises, animadversion on their spirit and execution, 306.
Bull (Bishop), observations on his writings, 348.

C.

Centralization, mischievous tendency of it, 161.
Chalmers (Dr.), his remarks on the prospects and future fortunes of the Church of England, 392, 393—observations on the Doctor's remarks, 393, 394.
Character, difficulty of delineating it accurately, 423.
Charity bazaars, remarks on them, 195-197.
Church, the witness of, its paramount authority, 9, 10—its permanence a guarantee for the permanence of moral principles, 27, 52, 161, 162, 308—marks of the Church Catholic, 354—effect of the Church upon the superstition of the middle ages, 381, 382—its composition in those days, 383.
Churches, the Anglican and Roman, contrasted, 69.
Church of England, possesses Catholicism in the truest sense, 72—restoration of her discipline, 168—theology of, its peculiar character, 347—her present prospects and duties, 393-395—demands which she has on the state, 411—*theory of the Church*, 421.
Church in Upper Canada, state of it, 400—importance of missionary efforts in the colonies, *ib.*—religious destitution of the people, 403—proofs of this, 403-406—symptoms of the religious tone of feeling there, 405—extracts from Mr. Bettridge's account, 407—propagation of dangerous errors, *ib.* [note]—amount of the population, 408—want of churches, 409—provision for the clergy, 411—the sectaries, 412—dangerous consequences of this spiritual destitution, 413—friendly disposition of the settlers towards the Church, 414—importance of the present crisis, 415—"Clergy reserves," 416—measures introduced by government with respect to them, 417—steps which the members of the Church ought to take, 417, 418—efforts of the Romanists, 421.
Council of Constance, authority and decisions of, 73.
Councils of the Middle Ages, not really oecumenical, 369.

D.

Democracy, unmoved by feelings of generous affection, 401—tendency of its temper, *ib.*
Diaries, religious, advantages and abuses of them, 248, 249.
Dissent and Romanism, of the present day, 47.
Dissenters, their opposition to the establishment of the Church in our foreign dependencies, 166.
Dryden, the foremost in the list of secondary poets, 439.

E.

Eastern and Western Churches, their comparative territorial extent, 368.
Eclecticism, characteristics of a sound system of, 9.
Education, a good system of, what? 38—want of a good schoolmaster's manual for general use, 211—"The National Society," 212, 213.
Episcopal office, its scriptural character, 163.
Errors, in morals, danger of them, 26.
Established Church, benefits of one, 164, 165.
Evidences of Religion, mischievous tendency of certain modern publications of this class, 306.
Exeter Hall, "Random Recollections of," 190—remarks on the religious meetings held there, 197, 198, 202, 210.
Expression by metrical words the essence of poetry, 428.
Expressive, in what sense the human countenance is said to be so, 429.

F.

Faber (Rev. G. S.), on the doctrine of justification, 82—character of his work, 114—attempts to establish the doctrine of forensic justification, in opposition to the Romish doctrine of righteousness inherent and infused, *ib.*—a satisfactory appeal to the Fathers on this point, *ib.*—this accounted for, 114, 115.
Faith, its nature and properties, 102, 103—its operative nature, 103, 104.
France, eclectic spirit in philosophy, which it is intended to revive there, 9.
Fundamentals in Faith, the doctrine of, 367.
Funds, desirableness of applying to the promotion of special religious objects, 418.

G.

- Geraldine*—a Tale of Conscience, character and design of it, 61, 82—mistakes respecting the second General Council, 72, 73.
Giulia Hemans, possessed the true poetical genius of painting, 432.
Glasgow Model School, the training system adopted there, 211.
Greek Philosophy, beauty of external form, a source of its influence, 7—spirit in which it ought to be made an instrument of education, 10.

H.

- Hey (Dr.)*, on Faith, 118.
History, its great and venerable foundations upon which it is commonly based, 372, 373.
Hobbes, his excessive superstition, 386.
Homot, little satisfactorily known respecting him, 424—his descriptive pieces, 460.
Hooker's Works, their peculiar character, 348.

I.

- Idealism and Sensualism*, true solution of these doctrines, 328.
Imitation, in what sense poetry may be said to consist in it, 428, 435.
Innovation and novelty, an inordinate thirst after, a characteristic of the present day, 1, 38.

J.

- James (St.)*, and St. Paul, reconciled, with reference to Faith, 110, 111.
Jay (John), First Chief Justice of the United States and Governor of New York, 146—his parentage and early education, 148—represents New York in Congress, 149—draws up the Address of Congress to the People of Great Britain, *ib.*—petition to the King, *ib.*—is chosen Chief Justice, 152—is sent ambassador to Spain, *ib.*—visits Paris, and is empowered to conclude a peace with Great Britain, 154—appointed Foreign Secretary to Congress, 155—visits England for the purpose of concluding a Commercial Treaty, 157—is appointed Governor of New York, *ib.*—his retirement from public life, 162—motives for this step, *ib.*—his attachment to the Church of England, *ib.*

Justification, the doctrine of, discussed, 82—mode in which the subject has been treated by Mr. Newman and Mr. Faber, 85—the Lutheran doctrine, 89—not to be confounded with sanctification, 91, 101—illustration of the doctrine, 93, 94, 95—the imputative nature of justification, 93-97—opinions of St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, St. Bernard, Pope Gregory, and of Hooker, 97—quotation on this subject from Barrow, 101.

K.

Ken (Bishop), Prose Works, 167—excellence of his character, 168—his hymns, and devotional treatises, 169—his connexion with Bishop Turner, 170-173—his private life, 173—his character as a Christian bishop, 174—notice of Mr. Bowles's life of him, 175—differs from his non-juring brethren on the question of continuing a separation by private consecrations among themselves, 176—examination of his motives and principles on this point, 176-182—cedes to Bishop Hooper, as Bishop of Bath and Wells, 178—difficulties of the controversy between the non-jurors and their opponents, 179—Ken's assertion of his rights, 180—review of his works, 183—writings which are believed to be spurious, 184—Dryden's "Character of a good Parson," supposed to be a portrait of Ken, 185, 187—observations on the genuineness of the "Letter to Archbishop Tenison," 188, 189.

Kettlewell's "Christian Communion," Bishop Ken's high opinion of the work, 179, 181—his views, 180.

Knor (Alexander), his notions respecting the effects of heresies upon the Church Catholic, 83, 84—his ideas on the doctrine of justification, 84—the Lutheran doctrine of justification, according to him, 89—endeavoured to revive the Tridentine system of inherent righteousness, 115.

Knowledge goes hand in hand with obedience in religion, 247.

M.

Manson has shown what interest may be communicated to a romance on true Church principles, 483.

Martyn (Rev. H.), Memoir, Journals, and Letters of, 120—brief outline of his life,

R.

19—effect of the metaphysical notions of modern German annotators upon their judgment of Plato's writings, 19, 20—arrangement of his "Dialogues," 20—main design of them, 21, 22—the "Phædrus," 22, 23—difficulties in the study of his works, 24—correspondence of the times in which Plato wrote with the present, 25-47—light thrown upon his works by the "Clouds" of Aristophanes, *ib.*—passage from the "Republic" declaratory of his views, 28, 29, 56—extract from the "Protagoras," 30, 31—design of the "Cratylus," 32—general character of his writings, 34, 35—thoughts on education, 36, 37—his philosophy, 38—method pursued by him against the Sophists, 48—the Socrates of Plato not the real, living one, 49, 50—the floridness of his style accounted for, 49—his views of the mode in which truth is to be communicated, 53-55—the "Phædo," 514.

Poets of the highest order, few satisfactory accounts of them, 424—primary and secondary poets, 439—office of the poet, 474.

Poetry, definition of, 426, 427—considerations in support for the definition, 427—in what sense the term imitation is to be understood in Aristotle's definition of poetry, 428—poetry consists in the indirect expression of overpowering, but excited feelings, 431—poetry of painting and sculpture, *ib.*—effects of rhythm and metre upon it, 435, 436—in its metrical form deducible from two instinctive necessities of our nature, 436—expression, controlled and modified by reserve, the true soul of poetry, 437—a final cause of poetry, 439—primary poetry, 440—means of classifying poetical productions, *ib.*—its use, 271; 272—its power in regulating our sympathies, 273—poetical way of viewing things, 277—its application to religion and the fine arts, 295.

Political life, dangers of an exclusive devotion to it, 266.

Pritchard (Dr.), on animal magnetism, 310, 311.

Priests' judgment, true field for the exercise of, in matters of religion, 70—its nature and limits, 85, 86, 88—views of the Church of Rome, 86, 87—inconsistency of Ultra-Protestants respecting it, 87.

Public evangelism, its character and operation, 292.

Rationalism of the present day, its nature and tendency, 52.

Reformation of manners, associations for, evils of some of them, 254.

Religion, true, a social principle, 190, 193—not incompatible with statesmanship, 239.

Religious meetings, observations on them, 195, 196, 202, 210.

Republican government, its want of fixed principles, 158—its tendency to subvert natural rights, *ib.*

Revivals, religious, remarks on them, 195.

Revolutions, political, effected by passion, not by intellect, 35.

Rhythm and metre, their effect upon poetry, 435, 436.

Reformation, the, remarks on it, 388.

Romanism, not likely to spread in England, why, 71—adverse to the exercise of private judgment in matters of religion, 86, 87—doctrine of justification, as defined at the Council of Trent, 88—vain efforts of Romanism to raise itself in the present age, 338—groundless apprehensions of Romanism, *ib.*

Rubens, had no poetical conception of character, 431-433.

S.

Scepticism, tendency to it in the present day, 44, 45, 321.

Schism, definition of the term, 362.

Schoolmaster, for the "National Society," qualifications of, 216-219.

Schoolmaster's Manual, want of a good one, 212, 213—leading features of one, 213-224.

Science, new developments of, in the present day, feelings with which they are received, 303—conduct of sincere friends of religion, 304.

Scott (Sir Walter), Life, by Lockhart, 423—his high poetical reputation, 425—his prose romances essentially poems, *ib.*—plan adopted by his biographer, *ib.*—facility of it, 426—his autobiography, *ib.*—spirit which pervades his poetry, 442—"The Lay of the Last Minstrel," 443—Border and Highland romance, *ib.*—the origin of the "Lay," 444—classification of his works, 446—prevailing ingredients in his character, 447—"Bertram," *ib.*—has embodied his own personal remembrance in "Guy Mannering," 448—"The Pirate," 451

—all his writings more or less pervaded by his home associations and feelings, 452—his early poetical education, 458—his first acquaintance with Bishop Percy's "Reliques," 459—compared with Pindar, 460—the effects of his lameness contrasted with those of Byron's, 461—effects of his professional avocations, 462—his want of Greek literature, 464—his simplicity, 465, 467—and modesty, 467—his reserve with regard to the authorship of the novels, 470—the apparent liberalism of many of his reflections, *ib.*—early predictions of his literary eminence, 472—beneficial effects of his writings on the political views of the present generation, 473—conjectures respecting church poetry by Scott, 474—his dislike of the religious services of the kirk, 475—his religious education, *ib.*—his too elevated opinion of Byron's poetry in comparison with his own, 477—Scott's account of their intercourse, 478—his predilections for the system of the old Catholic Church, 479.

Sculpture, its relation to poetry, 433.

Secondary questions in religion, advantage of discussing them, 71.

Self-examination, cautions to be observed in it, 123.

Sensation and mind, separation of, 314.

Shakspeare, little satisfactorily known respecting him, 424.

Slave Trade, its abolition, 260—horrors of the system, 261.

Sleep, phenomena attending it, 315.

"*Society for the Propagation of the Gospel*," proposal for specific funds for particular objects, 418.

Sophist, signification of the term in the writings of the Greek philosophers, 31—occupation of the Sophists at Athens in the time of Plato, 31, 32—effects of their teaching upon the Athenian youth, 33, 34—their sceptical theory, 41, 42.

Sorcery and witchcraft, origin of, in the Middle Ages, 333.

Spanish council, formulary for the opening of one, 193.

Statesmanship and religion not incompatible, 239.

Stillingsfleet's works, their peculiar character, 348.

Superstition, its nature and tendency, 385-387.

Sympathy, influence of, 272.

Synodal Assemblies of the Church, observations on, 193, 194.

Tasso, his descriptive piece, 430.

Taylor's "Doctor Habitations", remarks on, 347.

Tertullian's description of the heretical assemblies, 194.

Testimony and authority, importance of them in matters of religion, 330.

Theological controversy, thoughts of Alexander Knox respecting the beneficial effects of it, 88.

Theological works, few systematic ones produced by divines of our Church, 347.

Thirty-nine articles, not standard exposition of them, 347.

Transubstantiation, doctrine of its origin, 369—its nature, 370.

Trach's poems, 282—extracts, 283.

—defects of his compositions, 282—improvement in his style, 284.

—*"The Character of his Poetry"*, 287.

—his death, *ib.*

Trent, Council of, errors of the Middle Ages incorporated into the Church by it, 387, 388.

Truths and Fictions of the Middle Ages, 372—character of the work, 372.

Turner (Bishop), contemporary and friend of Bishop Ken, 170—his troubles, 171—his political friends, *ib.*—his death, *ib.*

U.

Ultra-Protestantism, its nature and tendency, 354, 363.

V.

Virgil, his peculiar cast of thought, 440-463.

W.

Walpole (Sir Robert), his opposition to the plans of Berkeley for the conversion of the natives of America, 165.

Wilberforce (William), Life, by his son, 239—his birth and parentage, 243—his early religious impressions, 244—his early political life, *ib.*—decay of religion in the higher ranks of society, 241—influence of his religious character, 242—his intimacy with Isaac Milner, 245—his travels in company with

Milner, 246—his mode of life on his return to England, *ib.*—resumes his travels, *ib.*—his religious feelings at this time, *ib.*—his private journal, 248, 249—avows the change in his religious views, 251—his public life, *ib.*—ceases to attach himself to party, *ib.*—Society for the Reformation of Manners, 252—his connexion with the Church Missionary and Bible Societies, *ib.*—his work, "on Practical Christianity," *ib.*—character of the work, 253—effects of his connexion with various religious associations, *ib.*—his efforts for the suppression of the English slave-trade, 254, 255—letter from John Wesley, 255—difficulties of his undertaking, 256—his religious agitation, 257—the Jacobin Convention, 258—abolition of the slave-trade, 260—his public life, 261—his views of Roman Catholic emancipation, *ib.*—his retirement from parliament, 262—his death, *ib.*—his character, 264—extracts from his Journal, 265—his testimony to the public

spirit of Pitt, 266—his imperfect acquaintance with the earlier history of the Church, *ib.*—remark on religious diaries, 267—opinion of Edward Irving, *ib.*—his intellectual capacities and accomplishments, 268—Madame de Staël's opinion of his conversational powers, *ib.*—his rhetorical powers, *ib.*

Witchcraft and sorcery, origin of, in the Middle Ages, 333.

Writing, the art of, connected with the issuing of the Mosaic dispensation, 389-391.

X.

Ximenes, his character as an ecclesiastic and politician, 240.

Y.

Youth, education of, its great importance, 36.

LONDON :
C. ROWORTH AND SONS, BELL YARD,
TEMPLE BAR.

